arXiv:1611.01205v1 [stat.ME] 3 Nov 2016

POSTERIOR GRAPH SELECTION AND ESTIMATION CONSISTENCY FOR HIGH-DIMENSIONAL BAYESIAN DAG MODELS

By Xuan Cao, Kshitij Khare and Malay Ghosh

University of Florida

Covariance estimation and selection for high-dimensional multivariate datasets is a fundamental problem in modern statistics. Gaussian directed acyclic graph (DAG) models are a popular class of models used for this purpose. Gaussian DAG models introduce sparsity in the Cholesky factor of the inverse covariance matrix, and the sparsity pattern in turn corresponds to specific conditional independence assumptions on the underlying variables. A variety of priors have been developed in recent years for Bayesian inference in DAG models, yet crucial convergence and sparsity selection properties for these models have not been thoroughly investigated. Most of these priors are adaptations/generalizations of the Wishart distribution in the DAG context. In this paper, we consider a flexible and general class of these 'DAG-Wishart' priors with multiple shape parameters. Under mild regularity assumptions, we establish strong graph selection consistency and establish posterior convergence rates for estimation when the number of variables p is allowed to grow at an appropriate sub-exponential rate with the sample size n.

1. Introduction. One of the major challenges in modern day statistics is to formulate models and develop inferential procedures to understand the complex multivariate relationships present in high dimensional datasets, where the number of variables is much larger than the number of samples. The covariance matrix, denoted by Σ, is one of the most fundamental objects that quantifies relationships between variables in multivariate datasets. A common and effective approach for covariance estimation in sample starved settings is to induce sparsity either in the covariance matrix, its inverse, or the Cholesky parameter of the inverse. The sparsity patterns in these matrices can be uniquely encoded in terms of appropriate graphs. Hence the corresponding models are often referred to as covariance graph models (sparsity in Σ), concentration graph models (sparsity in $\Omega = \Sigma^{-1}$), and directed acyclic graph (DAG) models (sparsity in the Cholesky parameter of Ω).

MSC 2010 subject classifications: Primary 62F15; secondary 62G20

Keywords and phrases: posterior consistency, high-dimensional data, Bayesian DAG models, covariance estimation, graph selection

In this paper, we focus on Gaussian DAG models. In particular, suppose we have i.i.d. observations $\mathbf{Y}_1, \mathbf{Y}_2, \cdots, \mathbf{Y}_n$ from a p-variate normal distribution with mean vector $\mathbf{0}$ and covariance matrix Σ. Let $\Omega = LD^{-1}L^T$ be the modified Cholesky decomposition of the inverse covariance matrix $\Omega = \Sigma^{-1}$, i.e., L is a lower triangular matrix with unit diagonal entries, and D is a diagonal matrix with positive diagonal entries. For a DAG model, this normal distribution is assumed to be Markov with respect to a given directed acyclic graph $\mathscr{D}$ with vertices $\{1, 2, \cdots, p\}$ (edges directed from larger to smaller vertices). This is equivalent to saying that $L_{ij} = 0$ whenever $\mathscr{D}$ does not have a directed edge from i to j (these concepts are discussed in detail in Section 2). Hence a Gaussian DAG model restricts Σ (and Ω) to a lower dimensional space by imposing sparsity constraints encoded in $\mathscr{D}$ on L.

A variety of penalized likelihood methods for sparse estimation of L exist in the literature, see [7, 15, 14, 8, 19]. Some of these methods constrain the sparsity pattern in L to be banded, whereas others put no constraints on the sparsity pattern. Most of the above methods derive asymptotic estimation and model selection consistency properties for the resulting estimator in a an appropriate high-dimensional regime. On the Bayesian side, the first class of priors on the restricted space of covariance matrices corresponding to a Gaussian DAG model was initially developed in [6, 16]. As pointed out in [3], the priors in [6] can be considered as analogs of the $\mathcal{G}$-Wishart distribution for concentration graph models (inducing sparsity in Ω). In fact, for the special case of perfect DAGs the priors in [6] are same as the $\mathcal{G}$-Wishart priors. As with the $\mathcal{G}$-Wishart priors, the priors in [6] have a single shape parameter. Letac and Massam [9] introduced a flexible class of priors with multiple shape parameters which facilitate differential shrinkage in high-dimensional settings. However, these priors are defined only for perfect DAG models. Recently, Ben-David et al. [3] introduce a class of DAG-Wishart distributions with multiple shape parameters. This class of distributions is defined for arbitrary DAG models, and is identical to the Letac-Massam $IW_{P_\mathcal{G}}$ priors for the special case of perfect DAG models. Thus, this class of DAG-Wishart distributions offers a flexible framework for Bayesian inference in Gaussian DAG models, and generalizes previous Wishart-based priors for DAG models.

The priors above are specified for a known DAG $\mathscr{D}$, and provide a Bayesian approach for estimating the covariance matrix. However, if the underlying DAG is not known and needs to be selected, one can easily extend this framework by specifying a prior on the space of DAGs, and looking at the posterior probabilities of the DAGs given the data. Such an approach was used in the context of concentration graph models in [2].

Despite the developments in Bayesian methods for analyzing Gaussian DAG models, a comprehensive evaluation of the high-dimensional consistency properties of these methods has not been undertaken to the best of our knowledge. Assuming the data comes from a "true" DAG model, two aspects of the asymptotic behavior of the posterior are of interest: (a) assigning high posterior probability to the "true" underlying graph (graph selection consistency), and (b) estimating the "true" covariance matrix accurately (estimation consistency).

Gaussian concentration graph models, which induce sparsity in the inverse covariance matrix Ω, are a related but markedly different class of models as compared to Gaussian DAG models. The two classes of models intersect only at perfect DAGs, which are equivalent to decomposable concentration graph models. In the context of concentration graph models, high dimensional posterior estimation consistency has been explored in recent work [1, 2, 18]. In [1, 18] estimation consistency is establsihed for the decomposable concentration graph models when the underlying concentration graph is known, and the number of variables p is allowed to increase at an appropriate sub-exponential rate relative to the sample size n. Banerjee and Ghosal [2] get rid of the assumption of decomposability and do not assume the true concentration graph is known. They use independent Laplace priors for the off-diagonal entries of the inverse covariance matrix, and use independent Bernoulli priors for the edges of the concentration graph. In this framework, estimation consistency is established in [2] under suitable regularity assumptions when $\sqrt{(p+s)\log p}/n \to 0$ (s denotes the total number of non-zero off-diagonal entries in the "true" inverse covariance matrix). The authors do not address model selection consistency, but provide high-dimensional Laplace approximations for the marginal posterior probabilities for the graphs, along with a proof of the validity of these approximations.

In this paper, our goal is to explore both model selection and estimation consistency in a high-dimensional setting for Gaussian DAG models. In particular, we consider a hierarchical Gaussian DAG model with DAG-Wishart priors on the covariance matrix and independent Bernoulli priors for each edge in the DAG. Under standard regularity assumptions, which include letting p increase at an appropriate sub exponential rate with n, we establish *posterior ratio consistency* (Theorem 4.1), i.e., the ratio of the maximum marginal posterior probability assigned to a "non-true" DAG to the posterior probability assigned to the "true" DAG converges to zero in probability under the true model. In particular, this implies that the true DAG will be the mode of the posterior DAG distribution with probability tending to 1 as $n \to \infty$. Next, under the additional assumption that the prior over DAGs is

restricted to graphs with edge size less than an appropriate function of the sample size n, we show *strong graph selection consistency* (Theorem 4.2) and establish a posterior convergence rate for estimation of the inverse covariance matrix (Theorem 6.1). Strong graph selection consistency implies that under the true model, the posterior probability of the true graph converges in probability to 1 as $n \to \infty$. As pointed out in Remark 2, the assumption of restricting the prior over models with appropriately bounded parameter size has been used in [11] for regression models, and in [2] for concentration graph models.

Narisetty and He [11] establish strong model selection consistency of high-dimensional regression models with spike and slab priors. While there are some connections between our model and the one in [11] since the entries of L can be interpreted as appropriate regression coefficients, there are fundamental differences between the the two models and the corresponding analyses. A detailed explanation of this is provided in Remark 1.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 provides background material from graph theory and Gaussian DAG models. In Section 3 we provide the hierarchical Bayesian DAG model. Graph selection consistency results are stated in Section 4, and the proofs are provided in Section 5. Posterior convergence rates for the inverse covariance matrix are established in Section 6.

2. Preliminaries. In this section, we provide the necessary background material from graph theory, Gaussian DAG models, and DAG-Wishart distributions.

2.1. *Gaussian DAG models.* Throughout this paper, a directed acyclic graph (DAG) $\mathscr{D} = (V, E)$ consists of the vertex set $V = \{1, \ldots, p\}$ and an edge set E such that there is no directed path starting and ending at the same vertex. As in [3], we will without loss of generality assume a parent ordering, where that all the edges are directed from larger vertices to smaller vertices. The set of parents of i, denoted by $pa_i(\mathscr{D})$, is the collection of all vertices which are larger than i and share an edge with i. Similarly, the set of children of i, denoted by $chi_i(\mathscr{D})$, is the collection of all vertices which are smaller than i and share an edge with i.

A Gaussian DAG model over a given DAG $\mathscr{D}$, denoted by $\mathscr{N}_{\mathscr{D}}$, consists of all multivariate Gaussian distributions which obey the directed Markov property with respect to a DAG $\mathscr{D}$. In particular, if $\boldsymbol{y} = (y_1, \ldots, y_p)^T \sim N_p(0, \Sigma)$ and $N_p(0, \Sigma) \in \mathscr{N}_{\mathscr{D}}$, then $y_i \perp \boldsymbol{y}_{\{i+1,\ldots,p\} \setminus pa_i(\mathscr{D})} | \boldsymbol{y}_{pa_i(\mathscr{D})}$ for each i.

Any positive definite matrix Ω can be uniquely decomposed as $\Omega = LD^{-1}L^T$, where L is a lower triangular matrix with unit diagonal entries,

and D is a diagonal matrix with positive diagonal entries. This decomposition is known as the modified Cholesky decomposition of Ω (see for example [13]). It is well-known that if $\Omega = LD^{-1}L^T$ is the modified Cholesky decomposition of Ω, then $N_p(0, \Omega^{-1}) \in \mathscr{N}_{\mathscr{D}}$ if and only if $L_{ij} = 0$ whenever $i \notin pa_j(\mathscr{D})$. In other words, the structure of the DAG $\mathscr{D}$ is reflected in the Cholesky factor of the inverse covariance matrix. In light of this, it is often more convenient to reparametrize in terms of the Cholesky parameter of the inverse covariance matrix as follows.

Given a DAG $\mathscr{D}$ on p vertices, denote $\mathscr{L}_{\mathscr{D}}$ as the set of lower triangular matrices with unit diagonals and $L_{ij} = 0$ if $i \notin pa_j(\mathscr{D})$, and let $\mathscr{D}_+^p$ be the set of strictly positive diagonal matrices in $\mathbb{R}^{p\times p}$. We refer to $\Theta_{\mathscr{D}} = \mathscr{D}_+^p \times \mathscr{L}_{\mathscr{D}}$ as the Cholesky space corresponding to $\mathscr{D}$, and $(D, L) \in \Theta_{\mathscr{D}}$ as the Cholesky parameter corresponding to $\mathscr{D}$. In fact, the relationship between the DAG and the Cholesky parameter implies that

$$\mathscr{N}_{\mathscr{D}} = \{N_p(0, (L^T)^{-1}DL^{-1}) : (D, L) \in \Theta_{\mathscr{D}}\}.$$

The skeleton of $\mathscr{D}$, denoted by $\mathscr{D}^u = (V, E^u)$, can be obtained by replacing all the directed edges of $\mathscr{D}$ by undirected ones. A DAG $\mathscr{D}$ is said to be perfect if the parents of all vertices are adjacent. An undirected graph is called decomposable if it has no induced cycle of length $n \geq 4$, excluding the loops. It is known that if $\mathscr{D}$ is a perfect directed acyclic graph (DAG), then $\mathscr{D}^u$ is a decomposable graph. Conversely, given an undirected decomposable graph, one can always direct the edges so that the resulting graph is a perfect DAG. This fact can be used to show that the class of normal distributions satisfying the directed Markov property with respect to $\mathscr{D}$ (DAG models, sparsity in L) is identical to the class of normal distributions satisfying the undirected Markov property with respect to $\mathscr{D}^u$ (concentration graph models, sparsity in Ω) *if and only if* $\mathscr{D}$ is a perfect DAG. (see [12]).

2.2. *DAG-Wishart distribution.* In this section, we specify the multiple shape parameter DAG-Wishart distributions introduced in [3]. First, we provide required notation. Given a directed graph $\mathscr{D} = (V, E)$, with $V = \{1, \ldots, p\}$, and a $p \times p$ matrix A, denote the column vectors $A_{\mathscr{D}.i}^{>} = (A_{ij})_{j\in pa_i(\mathscr{D})}$ and $A_{\mathscr{D}.i}^{\geq} = (A_{ii}, (A_{\mathscr{D}.i}^{>})^T)^T$. Also, let $A_{\mathscr{D}}^{>i} = (A_{kj})_{k,j\in pa_i(\mathscr{D})}$,

$$A_{\mathscr{D}}^{\geq i} = \begin{bmatrix} A_{ii} & (A_{\mathscr{D}.i}^{>})^T \\ A_{\mathscr{D}.i}^{>} & A_{\mathscr{D}}^{>i} \end{bmatrix}.$$

In particular, $A_{\mathscr{D}.p}^{\geq} = A_{\mathscr{D}}^{\geq p} = A_{pp}$.

The DAG-Wishart distributions in [3] corresponding to a DAG $\mathscr{D}$ are defined on the Cholesky space $\Theta_{\mathscr{D}}$. Given a positive definite matrix U and a

p-dimensional vector $\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\mathscr{D})$, the (unnormalized) density of the DAG-Wishart distribution on $\Theta_{\mathscr{D}}$ is given by

$$\exp\{-\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}((LD^{-1}L^T)U)\}\prod_{i=1}^{p} D_{ii}^{-\frac{\alpha_i(\mathscr{D})}{2}}, \tag{2.1}$$

for every $(D, L) \in \Theta_{\mathscr{D}}$. Let $\nu_i(\mathscr{D}) = |pa_i(\mathscr{D})| = |\{j : j > i, (j, i) \in E(\mathscr{D})\}|$. If $\alpha_i(\mathscr{D}) - \nu_i(\mathscr{D}) > 2$, for all $1 \leq i \leq p$, the density in (2.1) can be normalized to a probability density, and the normalizing constant is given by

(2.2)

$$z_{\mathscr{D}}(U, \boldsymbol{\alpha}(\mathscr{D})) = \prod_{i=1}^{p} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\alpha_i(\mathscr{D})}{2} - \frac{\nu_i(\mathscr{D})}{2} - 1)2^{\frac{\alpha_i(\mathscr{D})}{2}-1}(\sqrt{\pi})^{\nu_i(\mathscr{D})} det(U_{\mathscr{D}}^{>i})^{\frac{\alpha_i(\mathscr{D})}{2}-\frac{\nu_i(\mathscr{D})}{2}-\frac{3}{2}}}{det(U_{\mathscr{D}}^{\geq i})^{\frac{\alpha_i(\mathscr{D})}{2}-\frac{\nu_i(\mathscr{D})}{2}-1}},$$

In this case, we define the DAG-Wishart density $\pi^{\Theta_{\mathscr{D}}}_{U,\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\mathscr{D})}$ on the Cholesky space $\Theta_{\mathscr{D}}$ by

$$\pi^{\Theta_{\mathscr{D}}}_{U,\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\mathscr{D})}(D, L) = \frac{1}{z_{\mathscr{D}}(U, \boldsymbol{\alpha}(\mathscr{D}))} exp\{-\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}((LD^{-1}L^T)U)\}\prod_{i=1}^{p} D_{ii}^{-\frac{\alpha_i(\mathscr{D})}{2}}$$

for every $(D, L) \in \Theta_{\mathscr{D}}$. The above density has the same form as the classical Wishart density, but is defined on the lower dimensional space $\Theta_{\mathscr{D}}$ and has p shape parameters $\{\alpha_i(\mathscr{D})\}_{i=1}^{p}$ which can be used for differential shrinkage of the variables in high-dimensional settings.

The class of densities $\pi^{\Theta_{\mathscr{D}}}_{U,\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\mathscr{D})}$ form a conjugate family of priors for the Gaussian DAG model $\mathscr{N}(\mathscr{D})$. In particular, if the prior on $(D, L) \in \Theta_{\mathscr{D}}$ is $\pi^{\Theta_{\mathscr{D}}}_{U,\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\mathscr{D})}$ and $\boldsymbol{Y}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{Y}_n$ are independent, identically distributed $N_p(\mathbf{0}, (L^T)^{-1}DL^{-1})$ random vectors, then the posterior distribution of (D, L) is $\pi^{\Theta_{\mathscr{D}}}_{\tilde{U},\tilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathscr{D})}$, where $S = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \boldsymbol{Y}_i\boldsymbol{Y}_i^T$ denotes the sample covariance matrix, $\tilde{U} = U + nS$, and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathscr{D}) = (n + \alpha_1(\mathscr{D}), \ldots, n + \alpha_p(\mathscr{D}))$.

3. Model specification. Let $\boldsymbol{Y}_1, \boldsymbol{Y}_2, \cdots, \boldsymbol{Y}_n \in \mathbb{R}^p$ be the observed data. The class of DAG-Wishart distributions in Section 2 can be used for Bayesian covariance estimation and DAG selection through the following hierarchical model.

$$\begin{aligned} &\boldsymbol{Y}|\,((D, L), \mathscr{D}) \sim N_p\left(\mathbf{0}, (LD^{-1}L^T)^{-1}\right), \\ &(D, L)|\mathscr{D} \sim \pi^{\Theta_{\mathscr{D}}}_{U,\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\mathscr{D})}, \\ &\pi(\mathscr{D}) = \prod_{i=1}^{p-1} q^{\nu_i(\mathscr{D})}(1-q)^{p-i-\nu_i(\mathscr{D})}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

The prior density for DAGs above corresponds to an Erdos-Renyi type of distribution on the space of DAGs, where each directed edge is present with probability q independently of the other edges. In particular, similar to [2], define $\gamma_{ij} = \mathbb{I}\{(i,j) \in E(\mathscr{D})\}$, $1 \le i < j \le p$ to be the edge indicator. Let γ_{ij}, $1 \le i < j < p$ be independent identically distributed Bernoulli(q) random variables. It follows that

$$\pi(\mathscr{D}) = \prod_{(i,j):1\le i<j\le p} q^{\gamma_{ij}} (1-q)^{1-\gamma_{ij}} = \prod_{i=1}^{p-1} q^{\nu_i(\mathscr{D})}(1-q)^{p-i-\nu_i(\mathscr{D})}.$$

The model in (3.1) has three hyperparameters: the scale matrix U (positive definite), the shape parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\mathscr{D})$, and the edge probability q.

The hierarchical model in (3.1) can be used to estimate a DAG as follows. By (3.1) and Bayes' rule, the (marginal) posterior DAG probabilities are given by

(3.2)
$$\begin{aligned}
&\pi(\mathscr{D}|\boldsymbol{Y}) \\
=&\int_{\Theta_{\mathscr{D}}} \frac{\pi(\boldsymbol{Y}|\mathscr{D},(L,D))\pi^{\Theta_{\mathscr{D}}}_{U,\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\mathscr{D})}((L,D))\pi(\mathscr{D})}{\pi(\boldsymbol{Y})} dLdD \\
=&\frac{\pi(\mathscr{D})}{\pi(\boldsymbol{Y})}\int_{\Theta_{\mathscr{D}}} \pi(\boldsymbol{Y}|\mathscr{D},(L,D))\pi((L,D)|\mathscr{D}))dLdD \\
=&\frac{\pi(\mathscr{D})}{\pi(\boldsymbol{Y})}\int_{\Theta_{\mathscr{D}}} \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}(LD^{-1}L^T(U+nS))\right)\prod_{i=1}^p D_{ii}^{-\left(n+\frac{\alpha_i(\mathscr{D})}{2}\right)}}{z_{\mathscr{D}}(U,\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\mathscr{D}))} dLdD \\
=&\frac{\pi(\mathscr{D})}{\pi(\boldsymbol{Y})(\sqrt{2\pi})^n}\frac{z_{\mathscr{D}}(U+nS,n+\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\mathscr{D}))}{z_{\mathscr{D}}(U,\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\mathscr{D}))}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the marginal posterior density $\pi(\mathscr{D}|\boldsymbol{Y})$ is available in closed form (up to the multiplicative constant $\pi(\boldsymbol{Y})$). In particular, these posterior probabilities can be used to select a DAG by computing the posterior mode defined by

$$\hat{\mathscr{D}} = \arg\max_{\mathscr{D}} \pi(\mathscr{D}|\boldsymbol{Y}). \tag{3.3}$$

4. DAG selection consistency: main results. In this section we will explore the high-dimensional asymptotic properties of the Bayesian DAG selection approach specified in Section 3. For this purpose, we will work in a setting where the dimension $p = p_n$ of the data vectors, and the edge probabilities $q = q_n$ vary with the sample size n. We assume that the data is

actually being generated from a true model which can be specified as follows. Let $\boldsymbol{Y}_1^n, \boldsymbol{Y}_2^n, \ldots, \boldsymbol{Y}_n^n$ be independent and identically distributed p_n-variate Gaussian vectors with mean 0 and covariance matrix $\Sigma_0^n = (\Omega_0^n)^{-1}$. Let $\Omega_0^n = L_0^n(D_0^n)^{-1}(L_0^n)^T$ be the modified Cholesky decomposition of Ω_0^n. Let $\mathscr{D}_0^n$ be the true underlying DAG, i.e, $L_0^n \in \mathscr{L}_{\mathscr{D}_0^n}$. Denote d_n as the maximum number of non-zero entries in any row (column) of L_0^n, $s_n = \min_{j \in pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0^n)} |(L_0^n)_{ji}|$. Let $\bar{P}$ and $\bar{E}$ respectively denote the probability measure and expected value corresponding to the "true" Gaussian DAG model presented above.

In order to establish our asymptotic results, we need the following mild regularity assumptions. Each assumption below is followed by an interpretation/discussion. Note that for a symmetric $p \times p$ matrix $A = (A_{ij})_{1 \le i,j \le p}$, let $eig_1(A) \le eig_2(A) \ldots eig_p(A)$ denote the ordered eigenvalues of A.

ASSUMPTION 1. *The eigenvalues of all the true concentration matrices* $\{\Omega_0^n\}_{n \ge 1}$ *are uniformly bounded in* n*, i.e., for any* $n \ge 1$*. In particular, there exists a* $\epsilon_0 > 0$ *such that* $0 < \epsilon_0 \le eig_1(\Omega_0^n) \le eig_{p_n}(\Omega_0^n) \le \epsilon_0^{-1} < \infty$.

This is a standard assumption for high dimensional covariance asymptotics, both in the frequentist and Bayesian paradigms. See for example [4, 5, 1, 18, 2].

ASSUMPTION 2. $d_n^{2+k}\sqrt{\frac{\log p_n}{n}} \to 0$ *as* $n \to \infty$ *and* $\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log p_n}{n}}\right)^{\frac{k}{2(k+2)}} \log n \to 0$ *for some* $k > 0$.

This assumption essentially states that the number of variables p_n has to grow slower than $e^{n/d_n^{4+2k}}$ (and also $e^{n/(\log n)^{2+k}}$). Again, similar assumptions are common in high dimensional covariance asymptotics, see for example [4, 18, 1, 2].

ASSUMPTION 3. *Let* $q_n = e^{-\eta_n n}$ *in model prior (3.1), where* $\eta_n = d_n(\frac{\log p_n}{n})^{\frac{1/2}{1+k/2}}$. *Hence,* $q_n \to 0$, *as* $n \to \infty$.

This assumption provides the rate at which the edge probability q_n needs to approach zero. A similar assumption can be found in [11] in the context of linear regression. This can be interpreted as apriori penalizing graphs with a large number of edges.

ASSUMPTION 4. $\frac{\eta_n}{s_n^2} \to 0$ *as* $n \to \infty$.

Recall that s_n is the smallest (in absolute value) non-zero off-diagonal entry in L_0^n, and can be interpreted as the 'signal size'. Hence, this assumption provides a lower bound for the signal size that is needed for establishing consistency.

ASSUMPTION 5. *For every $n \geq 1$, the hyperparameters for the DAG-Wishart prior $\pi^{\Theta_{\mathscr{D}_n}}_{U_n,\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\mathscr{D}_n)}$ in (3.1) satisfy (i) $2 < \alpha_i(\mathscr{D}_n) - \nu_i(\mathscr{D}) < c$ for every $\mathscr{D}_n$ and $1 \leq i \leq p_n$, and (ii) $0 < \delta_1 \leq eig_1(U_n) \leq eig_{p_n}(U_n) \leq \delta_2 < \infty$. Here c, δ_1, δ_2 are constants not depending on n.*

This assumption provides mild restrictions on the hyperparameters for the DAG-Wishart distribution. The assumption $2 < \alpha_i(\mathscr{D}) - \nu_i(\mathscr{D})$ establishes prior propriety. Additionally, the eigenvalues of the scale matrix U_n are assumed to be uniformly bounded in n.

For the rest of this paper, $p_n, \Omega_0^n, \Sigma_0^n, L_0^n, D_0^n, \mathscr{D}_0^n, \hat{\mathscr{D}}^n, \mathscr{D}^n, d_n, s_n, \eta_n, q_n, A_n$ will be denoted as $p, \Omega_0, \Sigma_0, L_0, D_0, \mathscr{D}_0, \hat{\mathscr{D}}, \mathscr{D}, d, \eta, q, s, A$ as needed for notational convenience and ease of exposition.

We now state and prove the main DAG selection consistency results. Our first result establishes what we call as posterior ratio consistency. This notion of consistency implies that the true DAG will be the mode of the posterior DAG distribution with probability tending to 1 as $n \to \infty$.

THEOREM 4.1 (Posterior ratio consistency). *Under Assumptions 1-5, the following holds:*

$$\max_{\mathscr{D} \neq \mathscr{D}_0} \frac{\pi(\mathscr{D}|\boldsymbol{Y})}{\pi(\mathscr{D}_0|\boldsymbol{Y})} \to 0, \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

In particular, it implies that the posterior mode $\hat{D}$ defined in (3.3) is equal to the true DAG $\mathscr{D}_0$ with probability tending to 1, i.e.,

$$\bar{P}(\mathscr{D}_0 = \arg\max_{\mathscr{D}} \pi(\mathscr{D}|\boldsymbol{Y})) \to 1, \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

Next we establish a stronger result which implies that the posterior mass assigned to the true DAG $\mathscr{D}_0$ converges to 1 in probability (under the true model). Following [11], we refer to this notion of consistency as strong selection consistency. To establish this stronger notion of consistency, we restrict our analysis to DAGs with total number of edges bounded by an appropriate function of n (see also Remark 2).

THEOREM 4.2 (Strong selection consistency). *Under Assumptions 1-5, if we restrict only to DAG's with number of edges at most* $\frac{1}{8}d\left(\frac{n}{\log p}\right)^{\frac{1+k}{2+k}}$, *the following holds:*

$$\pi(\mathscr{D}_0|\boldsymbol{Y}) \xrightarrow{\bar{P}} 1, \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

REMARK 1. *In the context of linear regression, Narisetty and He [11] consider the following hierarchical Bayesian model.*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\boldsymbol{Y} \mid X, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2 \sim N(X\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2 I)\\
&\beta_i \mid \sigma^2, Z_i = 0 \sim N(0, \sigma^2 \tau_{0,n}^2)\\
&\beta_i \mid \sigma^2, Z_i = 1 \sim N(0, \sigma^2 \tau_{1,n}^2)\\
&P(Z_i = 1) = 1 - P(Z_i = 0) = q_n\\
&\sigma^2 \sim \textit{Inverse-Gamma}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2).
\end{aligned}$$

In particular, they put an independent spike and slab prior on each linear regression coefficient (conditional on the variance parameter σ^2*), and an inverse Gamma prior on the variance. Also, each regression coefficient is present in the model with a probability* q_n*. In this setting, the authors in [11] establish strong selection consistency for the regression coefficients (assuming the prior is constrained to leave out unrealistically large models). Note that the off-diagonal entries in the* i^{th} *column of* L *are the linear regression coefficients corresponding to fitting the* i^{th} *variable against all variables with label greater than* i*. Given this interpretation, and the fact that in our model (3.1) each coefficient is present independently with a given probability* q_n*, it is clear that there are similarities between the model in (3.1) and the model in [11]. However, there are some fundamental differences in the two models and the corresponding analysis. Firstly, the DAG-Wishart prior does not in general correspond to assigning an independent spike and slab prior to each entry of* L*. The columns of* L *are independent of each other under this prior, but it introduces correlations among the entries in each column of* L*. Also, the DAG-Wishart prior introduces exact sparsity in* L*, which is not the case in [11] as* $\tau_{0,n}^2$ *is assumed to be strictly positive. Hence it is structurally different than the prior in [11]. Secondly, the 'design' matrices corresponding to the regression coefficients in the each column of* L *are random (they are functions of the sample covariance matrix* S*) and are correlated with each other. In particular, this leads to differences and further challenges in analyzing the ratio of posterior graph probabilities (a crucial step in establishing consistency).*

REMARK 2. *We would like to point out that posterior ratio consistency (Theorem 4.1) does not require any restriction on the maximum number of edges, this requirement is only needed for strong selection consistency (Theorem 4.2). Similar restrictions on the prior model size have been considered for establishing consistency properties in other contexts. For concentration graph models, Banerjee and Ghosal [2] use a hierarchical prior where each edge of the concentration graph is independently present with a given probability q. For establishing high-dimensional posterior convergence rates, they restrict the prior to graphs with total number of edges bounded by an appropriate fixed constant. A variation where the upper bound on the number of edges is a random variable with sub-exponential tails is also considered. For linear regression, Narisetty and He [11] too restrict the prior model size to an appropriate function of n (number of non-zero regression coefficients) for establishing strong selection consistency (when the variance parameter is random).*

5. Proof of Theorems 4.1 and 4.2. The proof of Theorems 4.1 and 4.2 will be broken up into various steps. We begin by presenting a useful lemma that provides an upper bound for the ratio of posterior DAG probabilities.

LEMMA 5.1. *Under Assumption 5, for a large enough constant M and large enough n, the ratio of posterior probabilities of any DAG $\mathscr{D}$ and the true DAG $\mathscr{D}_0$ satisfies:*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\pi(\mathscr{D}|\boldsymbol{Y})}{\pi(\mathscr{D}_0|\boldsymbol{Y})} \\
&\leq \prod_{i=1}^{p} M \left(\frac{\delta_2}{\delta_1}\right)^{\frac{d}{2}} n^{2c} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\delta_2}{n}}\frac{q}{1-q}\right)^{\nu_i(\mathscr{D})-\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0)} \frac{|\tilde{S}^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}_0}|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|\tilde{S}^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}}|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{\left(\tilde{S}_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)}\right)^{\frac{n+c_i(\mathscr{D}_0)-3}{2}}}{\left(\tilde{S}_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D})}\right)^{\frac{n+c_i(\mathscr{D})-3}{2}}} \\
&\triangleq \prod_{i=1}^{p} B_i(\mathscr{D}, \mathscr{D}_0),
\end{aligned}$$

where $c_i(\mathscr{D}) = \alpha_i(\mathscr{D}) - \nu_i(\mathscr{D}), c_i(\mathscr{D}_0) = \alpha_i(\mathscr{D}_0) - \nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0)$, $\tilde{S} = S + \frac{U}{n}$, and $\tilde{S}_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D})} = \tilde{S}_{ii} - (\tilde{S}^{>}_{\mathscr{D}\cdot i})^T(\tilde{S}^{>i}_{\mathscr{D}})^{-1}\tilde{S}^{>}_{\mathscr{D}\cdot i}$.

PROOF. By 3.2, the posterior ratio is given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\pi(\mathscr{D}|\boldsymbol{Y})}{\pi(\mathscr{D}_0|\boldsymbol{Y})}\\
=&\frac{\pi(\mathscr{D})}{\pi(\mathscr{D}_0)}\frac{z_{\mathscr{D}}(U+nS,n+\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\mathscr{D}))/z_{\mathscr{D}}(U,\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\mathscr{D}))}{z_{\mathscr{D}_0}(U+nS,n+\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\mathscr{D}))/z_{\mathscr{D}_0}(U,\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\mathscr{D}))} \qquad (5.1)\\
=&\left(\prod_{i=1}^{p-1}(\frac{q}{1-q})^{\nu_i(\mathscr{D})-\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0)}\right)\frac{z_{\mathscr{D}}(U+nS,n+\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\mathscr{D}))/z_{\mathscr{D}}(U,\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\mathscr{D}))}{z_{\mathscr{D}_0}(U+nS,n+\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\mathscr{D}))/z_{\mathscr{D}_0}(U,\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\mathscr{D}))}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Using [3, eq. (11)], we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{z_{\mathscr{D}}(U+nS,n+\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\mathscr{D}))}{z_{\mathscr{D}}(U,\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\mathscr{D}))}\\
=&\prod_{i=1}^{p}\frac{\Gamma(\frac{n+\alpha_i(\mathscr{D})-\nu_i(\mathscr{D})-2}{2})2^{\frac{\alpha_i(\mathscr{D})+n-2}{2}}\frac{|(U+nS)^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}}|^{\frac{n+\alpha_i(\mathscr{D})-\nu_i(\mathscr{D})-3}{2}}}{|(U+nS)^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}}|^{\frac{n+\alpha_i(\mathscr{D})-\nu_i(\mathscr{D})-2}{2}}}}{\Gamma(\frac{\alpha_i(\mathscr{D})-\nu_i(\mathscr{D})-2}{2})2^{\frac{\alpha_i(\mathscr{D})-2}{2}}\frac{|U^{>i}_{\mathscr{D}}|^{\frac{\alpha_i(\mathscr{D})-\nu_i(\mathscr{D})-3}{2}}}{|U^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}}|^{\frac{\alpha_i(\mathscr{D})-\nu_i(\mathscr{D})-2}{2}}}}\\
=&\prod_{i=1}^{p}\frac{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2}+\frac{c_i(\mathscr{D})}{2}-1)}{\Gamma(\frac{c_i(\mathscr{D})}{2}-1)}2^{\frac{n}{2}}\frac{n^{-\frac{n+\alpha_i(\mathscr{D})-2}{2}}}{\frac{|U^{>i}_{\mathscr{D}}|^{\frac{\alpha_i(\mathscr{D})-\nu_i(\mathscr{D})-3}{2}}}{|U^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}}|^{\frac{\alpha_i(\mathscr{D})-\nu_i(\mathscr{D})-2}{2}}}}\frac{|\tilde{S}^{>i}_{\mathscr{D}}|^{\frac{n+c_i(\mathscr{D})-3}{2}}}{|\tilde{S}^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}}|^{\frac{n+c_i(\mathscr{D})-2}{2}}}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that

$$
|U^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}}| = |U^{>i}_{\mathscr{D}}|\left(U_{ii}-(U^{>}_{\mathscr{D}\cdot i})^T(U^{>i}_{\mathscr{D}})^{-1}U^{>}_{\mathscr{D}\cdot i}\right) = \left|U^{>i}_{\mathscr{D}}\right|\left(\left[(U^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}})^{-1}\right]_{ii}\right)^{-1},
$$

following from Assumption 5,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{|U^{>i}_{\mathscr{D}}|^{\frac{\alpha_i(\mathscr{D})-\nu_i(\mathscr{D})-3}{2}}}{|U^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}}|^{\frac{\alpha_i(\mathscr{D})-\nu_i(\mathscr{D})-2}{2}}} &= \frac{\left[(U^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}})^{-1}\right]_{ii}^{\frac{\alpha_i(\mathscr{D})-\nu_i(\mathscr{D})-3}{2}}}{\left|U^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}}}\\
&\geq \left(\frac{1}{\delta_2}\right)^{\frac{\alpha_i(\mathscr{D})-\nu_i(\mathscr{D})-3}{2}}\times\left(\frac{1}{\delta_2}\right)^{\frac{\nu_i(\mathscr{D})+1}{2}}\\
&\geq \left(\frac{1}{\delta_2}\right)^{\frac{\alpha_i(\mathscr{D})-2}{2}}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Similarly,

$$
\frac{|U^{>i}_{\mathscr{D}}|^{\frac{\alpha_i(\mathscr{D})-\nu_i(\mathscr{D})-3}{2}}}{|U^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}}|^{\frac{\alpha_i(\mathscr{D})-\nu_i(\mathscr{D})-2}{2}}} \leq \left(\frac{1}{\delta_1}\right)^{\frac{\alpha_i(\mathscr{D})-2}{2}}.
$$

Hence,

(5.2)
$$\frac{z_{\mathscr{D}}(U+nS, n+\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\mathscr{D}))}{z_{\mathscr{D}}(U, \boldsymbol{\alpha}(\mathscr{D}))} \le \prod_{i=1}^{p} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2}+\frac{c_i(\mathscr{D})}{2}-1)}{\Gamma(\frac{c_i(\mathscr{D})}{2}-1)} 2^{\frac{n}{2}} \frac{n^{-\frac{n+\alpha_i(\mathscr{D})-2}{2}}}{{\delta_2}^{-\frac{\alpha_i(\mathscr{D})-2}{2}}} \frac{|\tilde{S}_{\mathscr{D}}^{>i}|^{\frac{n+c_i(\mathscr{D})-3}{2}}}{|\tilde{S}_{\mathscr{D}}^{\ge i}|^{\frac{n+c_i(\mathscr{D})-2}{2}}},$$

and

(5.3)
$$\frac{z_{\mathscr{D}}(U+nS, n+\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\mathscr{D}))}{z_{\mathscr{D}}(U, \boldsymbol{\alpha}(\mathscr{D}))} \ge \prod_{i=1}^{p} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2}+\frac{c_i(\mathscr{D})}{2}-1)}{\Gamma(\frac{c_i(\mathscr{D})}{2}-1)} 2^{\frac{n}{2}} \frac{n^{-\frac{n+\alpha_i(\mathscr{D})-2}{2}}}{{\delta_1}^{-\frac{\alpha_i(\mathscr{D})-2}{2}}} \frac{|\tilde{S}_{\mathscr{D}}^{>i}|^{\frac{n+c_i(\mathscr{D})-3}{2}}}{|\tilde{S}_{\mathscr{D}}^{\ge i}|^{\frac{n+c_i(\mathscr{D})-2}{2}}}.$$

Note that all the bounds above hold for an arbitrary DAG $\mathscr{D}$, and in particular for the true DAG $\mathscr{D}_0$.

By Assumption 5, it follows that $2 < c_i(\mathscr{D}), c_i(\mathscr{D}_0) < c$. Using the fact that

$$\sqrt{x+\frac{1}{4}} \le \frac{\Gamma(x+1)}{\Gamma\left(x+\frac{1}{2}\right)} \le \sqrt{x+\frac{1}{2}}$$

for $x > 0$ (see [17]), it follows that for a large enough constant M' and large enough n, we have

$$\frac{\frac{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2}+\frac{c_i(\mathscr{D})}{2}-1)}{\Gamma(\frac{c_i(\mathscr{D})}{2}-1)}}{\frac{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2}+\frac{c_i(\mathscr{D}_0)}{2}-1)}{\Gamma(\frac{c_i(\mathscr{D}_0)}{2}-1)}} \le M' n^c, \tag{5.4}$$

Using Assumption 5, (5.2), (5.3), (5.4) and the definition of $d = d_n$, it follows that

$$\frac{\frac{z_{\mathscr{D}}(U+nS, n+\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\mathscr{D}))}{z_{\mathscr{D}}(U, \boldsymbol{\alpha}(\mathscr{D}))}}{\frac{z_{\mathscr{D}_0}(U+nS, n+\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\mathscr{D}_0))}{z_{\mathscr{D}_0}(U, \boldsymbol{\alpha}(\mathscr{D}_0))}} \le \prod_{i=1}^{p} M \left(\frac{\delta_2}{\delta_1}\right)^{\frac{d}{2}} n^{2c} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\delta_2}{n}}\right)^{\nu_i(\mathscr{D})-\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0)} \frac{|\tilde{S}_{\mathscr{D}}^{>i}|^{\frac{n+c_i(\mathscr{D})-3}{2}}}{|\tilde{S}_{\mathscr{D}}^{\ge i}|^{\frac{n+c_i(\mathscr{D})-2}{2}}}.$$

where $M = M' \max(\delta_2^c, 1) \max(\delta_1^{-c}, 1)$. It follows from (5.1) and $\nu_p(\mathscr{D}) = \nu_p(\mathscr{D}) = 0$ that

$$\frac{\pi(\mathscr{D}|\boldsymbol{Y})}{\pi(\mathscr{D}_0|\boldsymbol{Y})} \le \prod_{i=1}^{p} M \left(\frac{\delta_2}{\delta_1}\right)^{\frac{d}{2}} n^{2c} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\delta_2}{n}} \frac{q}{1-q}\right)^{\nu_i(\mathscr{D})-\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0)} \frac{\frac{|\tilde{S}_{\mathscr{D}}^{>i}|^{\frac{n+c_i(\mathscr{D})-3}{2}}}{|\tilde{S}_{\mathscr{D}}^{\ge i}|^{\frac{n+c_i(\mathscr{D})-2}{2}}}}{\frac{|\tilde{S}_{\mathscr{D}_0}^{>i}|^{\frac{n+c_i(\mathscr{D}_0)-3}{2}}}{|\tilde{S}_{\mathscr{D}_0}^{\ge i}|^{\frac{n+c_i(\mathscr{D}_0)-2}{2}}}}.$$

Next, note that

$$\begin{aligned}|\tilde{S}_{\mathscr{D}}^{\geq i}| &= |\tilde{S}_{\mathscr{D}}^{>i}||\tilde{S}_{ii} - (\tilde{S}_{\mathscr{D}\cdot i}^{>})^T(\tilde{S}_{\mathscr{D}}^{>i})^{-1}\tilde{S}_{\mathscr{D}\cdot i}^{>}| \\ &= |\tilde{S}_{\mathscr{D}}^{>i}|\tilde{S}_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D})}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the upper bound can be simplified as

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\pi(\mathscr{D}|\boldsymbol{Y})}{\pi(\mathscr{D}_0|\boldsymbol{Y})} \leq \prod_{i=1}^{p} M\left(\frac{\delta_2}{\delta_1}\right)^{\frac{d}{2}} n^{2c}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\delta_2}{n}}\frac{q}{1-q}\right)^{\nu_i(\mathscr{D})-\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0)} \frac{|\tilde{S}_{\mathscr{D}_0}^{\geq i}|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|\tilde{S}_{\mathscr{D}}^{\geq i}|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \\ \times \frac{\left(\tilde{S}_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)}\right)^{\frac{n+c_i(\mathscr{D}_0)-3}{2}}}{\left(\tilde{S}_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D})}\right)^{\frac{n+c_i(\mathscr{D})-3}{2}}}.\end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

□

Our goal is to find an upper bound (independent of $\mathscr{D}$ and i) for $B_i(\mathscr{D}, \mathscr{D}_0)$, such that the upper bound converges to 0 as $n \to \infty$. By Lemma 5.1, this will be enough to establish Theorem 4.1. Before we undertake this goal, we present a proposition that will be useful in further analysis. Note that for any positive definite matrix A, and $M \subseteq \{1, 2 \ldots, p\} \setminus \{i\}$, we denote $A_{i|M} = A_{ii} - A_{iM}A_{MM}^{-1}A_{Mi}$.

PROPOSITION 5.2. *Given a DAG $\mathscr{D}$ with p vertices,*

(a) If $pa_i(\mathscr{D}) \supseteq pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)$, then $(\Sigma_0)_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D})} = (D_0)_{ii} = (\Sigma_0)_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)}$ doesn't depend on $\mathscr{D}$.

(b) If $pa_i(\mathscr{D}) \subseteq pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)$, then $(\Sigma_0)_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D})} - (\Sigma_0)_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)} \geq \epsilon_0(\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0) - \nu_i(\mathscr{D}))s^2$, where $\epsilon_0 > 0$ and $s = \min_{j \in pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)} |(L_0)_{ji}|$.

PROOF. (a) Note that under the true model, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\boldsymbol{Y} \sim MVN(0, (L_0(D_0)^{-1}L_0^T)^{-1}), (L_0, D_0) \in \Theta_{\mathscr{D}_0}, \\ &Var\boldsymbol{Y} = (L_0(D_0)^{-1}L_0^T)^{-1}, \\ &Var(L_0^T\boldsymbol{Y}) = D.\end{aligned}$$

Let

$$\boldsymbol{Z} = L_0^T\boldsymbol{Y} = \begin{pmatrix} Y_1 + \sum_{i\geq 2}(L_0)_{i1}Y_i \\ \vdots \\ Y_j + \sum_{i\geq j+1}(L_0)_{ij}Y_i \\ \vdots \\ Y_p \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since $Var(\boldsymbol{Z}) = D, Z_1, \cdots, Z_p$ are mutually independent. Since $\boldsymbol{Y} = (L_0^T)^{-1}\boldsymbol{Z}$, it follows that

$$Z_i \perp \{Y_{i+1}, \cdots, Y_p\}.$$

Suppose $M \supseteq pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0), M \subseteq \{i+1, \cdots, p\}$. Since $(L_0)_{ki} = 0$ for $k \in M \setminus pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}(\Sigma_0)_{i|M} &= Var(Y_i|\boldsymbol{Y}_M) \\ &= Var(Y_i + \sum_{k \in pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)} (L_0)_{ki} Y_k | \boldsymbol{Y_M}) \\ &= Var(Z_i|\boldsymbol{Y_M}) = Var(Z_i) = (D_0)_{ii} = (\Sigma_0)_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)},\end{aligned}$$

The result follows, since by hypothesis $pa_i(\mathscr{D}) \supseteq pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)$, and by definition $pa_i(\mathscr{D}) \subseteq \{i+1, \ldots, p\}$.

(b) Let $\boldsymbol{Z}$ be as defined in the proof of part (a). since $pa_i(\mathscr{D}) \subseteq pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)$, we have

$$Z_i \perp (\boldsymbol{Y}_{pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0) \setminus pa_i(\mathscr{D})}, \boldsymbol{Y}_{pa_i(\mathscr{D})}).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}(\Sigma_0)_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D})} &= Var\left(Z_i - \sum_{j \in pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)} (L_0)_{ji} Y_j | \boldsymbol{Y}_{pa_i(\mathscr{D})}\right) \\ &= Var\left(Z_i - \sum_{j \in pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0) \setminus pa_i(\mathscr{D})} (L_0)_{ji} y_j | \boldsymbol{Y}_{pa_i(\mathscr{D})}\right) \\ &= (D_0)_{ii} + Var\left(\sum_{j \in pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0) \setminus pa_i(\mathscr{D})} (L_0)_{ji} y_j | \boldsymbol{Y}_{pa_i(\mathscr{D})}\right) \\ &\geq (\Sigma_0)_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)} + L_0^T Var(\boldsymbol{Y}_{pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0) \setminus pa_i(\mathscr{D})} | \boldsymbol{Y}_{pa_i(\mathscr{D})}) L \\ &\geq (\Sigma_0)_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)} + \epsilon_0 \sum_{j \in pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0) \setminus pa_i(\mathscr{D})} (L_0)_{ji}^2 \\ &\geq (\Sigma_0)_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)} + \epsilon_0 (\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0) - \nu_i(\mathscr{D})) s^2.\end{aligned}$$

The second last inequality follows from Assumption 1. □

Next, we show that in our setting, the sample and population covariance matrices are sufficiently close with high probability. It follows by Assumptions 1,2,5 and Lemma A.3 of [4] that there exists constants m_1, m_2 and δ depending on ϵ_0 only such that for $1 \leq i, j \leq p$, we have:

$$\bar{P}(|S_{ij} - (\Sigma_0)_{ij}| \geq t) \leq m_1 \exp\{-m_2 n t^2\},\ |t| \leq \delta.$$

By the union-sum inequality, for a large enough c' such that $2-m_2(c')^2/4 < 0$, we get that

$$\bar{P}(\|\tilde{S}-\Sigma_0\|_{\max} \geq c'\sqrt{\log p/n}) \leq m_1 p^{2-m_2(c')^2/4} \to 0. \tag{5.6}$$

Define the event C_n as

$$C_n = \{\|\tilde{S}-\Sigma_0\|_{\max} \geq c'\sqrt{\log p/n}\}. \tag{5.7}$$

It follows from (5.6) and (5.7) that $\bar{P}(C_n) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.

We now analyze the behavior of $B_i(\mathscr{D}, \mathscr{D}_0)$ under different scenarios in a sequence of five lemmas (Lemmas 5.3 - 5.7). Recall that our goal is to find an upper bound (independent of $\mathscr{D}$ and i) for $B_i(\mathscr{D}, \mathscr{D}_0)$, such that the upper bound converges to 0 as $n \to \infty$. **For all these lemmas, we will restrict ourselves to the event C_n^c.**

LEMMA 5.3. *If $pa_i(\mathscr{D}) \supset pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)$ and $\nu_i(\mathscr{D}) \leq 3\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0)+2$, then there exists N_1 (not depending on i or $\mathscr{D}$) such that for $n \geq N_1$ we have $B_i(\mathscr{D}, \mathscr{D}_0) \leq \epsilon_{1,n}$, where $\epsilon_{1,n} = 2e^{-\frac{\eta_n}{2}n}$.*

PROOF. Since $pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0) \subset pa_i(\mathscr{D})$, we can write $|\tilde{S}^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}}| = |\tilde{S}^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}_0}||R_{\tilde{S}^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}_0}}|$. Here $R_{\tilde{S}^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}_0}}$ is the Schur complement of $\tilde{S}^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}_0}$, defined by

$$R_{\tilde{S}^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}_0}} = D - B^T(\tilde{S}^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}_0})^{-1}B$$

for appropriate sub matrices B and D of $\tilde{S}^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}}$. Since $\tilde{S}^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}} \geq \left(\frac{U}{n}\right)^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}}$ [1], and $R^{-1}_{\tilde{S}^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}_0}}$ is a principal submatrix of $\left(\tilde{S}^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}}\right)^{-1}$, it follows from Assumption 5 that the largest eigenvalue of $R^{-1}_{\tilde{S}^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}_0}}$ is bounded above by $\frac{n}{\delta_1}$. Therefore,

$$\left(\frac{|\tilde{S}^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}_0}|}{|\tilde{S}^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}}|}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = |R^{-1}_{\tilde{S}^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}_0}}|^{1/2} \leq \left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{\delta_1}}\right)^{\nu_i(\mathscr{D})-\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0)}. \tag{5.8}$$

Since we are restricting ourselves to the event C_n^c, it follows by (5.6) that

$$||\tilde{S}^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}_0} - (\Sigma_0)^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}_0}||_{(2,2)} \leq (\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0)+1)c'\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}.$$

[1] For matrices A and B, we say $A \geq B$ if $A-B$ is positive semi-definite

Therefore,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&||(\tilde{S}^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}_0})^{-1} - ((\Sigma_0)^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}_0})^{-1}||_{(2,2)} \\
=&||(\tilde{S}^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}_0})^{-1}||_{(2,2)}||(\tilde{S}^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}_0})^{-1} - ((\Sigma_0)^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}_0})^{-1}||_{(2,2)}||((\Sigma_0)^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}_0})^{-1}||_{(2,2)} \\
\leq&(||(\tilde{S}^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}_0})^{-1} - ((\Sigma_0)^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}_0})^{-1}||_{(2,2)} + \frac{1}{\epsilon_0})(\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0)+1)c'\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}\frac{1}{\epsilon_0},
\end{aligned} \tag{5.9}
$$

By Assumption 2, there exists N_1' such that for $n \geq N_1'$,

$$
\frac{c'}{\epsilon_0}(d+1)\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}} < \frac{1}{2}, \text{ and } 2\frac{c'}{\epsilon_0^2}(d+1)\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}} < \frac{1}{\epsilon_0}.
$$

Since $\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0) \leq d$, it follows by (5.9) and Assumption 1 that

$$
||(\tilde{S}^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}_0})^{-1}||_{(2,2)} \leq \frac{2}{\epsilon_0},
$$

and

$$
\frac{1}{\tilde{S}_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)}} = \left[(\tilde{S}^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}_0})^{-1}\right]_{ii} \leq \frac{2}{\epsilon_0}. \tag{5.10}
$$

for $n \geq N_1'$. Since, $pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0) \subset pa_i(\mathscr{D})$, we get

$$
\tilde{S}_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)} \geq \tilde{S}_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D})}.
$$

Let N_1'' be such that for $n \geq N_1''$, $q \leq \frac{\sqrt{\delta_1}}{2\sqrt{\delta_2}} \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Using $2 < c_i(\mathscr{D}), c_i(\mathscr{D}_0) < c$, (5.8), (5.10), and Lemma 5.1, we get

(5.11)

$$
\begin{aligned}
B_i(\mathscr{D},\mathscr{D}_0) \leq& M\left(\frac{\delta_2}{\delta_1}\right)^{\frac{d}{2}} n^{2c}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\delta_2}{\delta_1}}\frac{q}{1-q}\right)^{\nu_i(\mathscr{D})-\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0)}\left(\frac{2}{\min(\epsilon_0,1)}\right)^c \\
&\times\left(\frac{\tilde{S}_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)}}{\tilde{S}_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D})}}\right)^{\frac{n+c-3}{2}} \\
\leq& M\left(\frac{2}{\min(\epsilon_0,1)}\right)^c\left(\frac{\delta_2}{\delta_1}\right)^{\frac{d}{2}} n^{2c}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\delta_2}{\delta_1}}2q\right)^{\nu_i(\mathscr{D})-\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0)}\left(\frac{\frac{1}{\tilde{S}_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D})}}}{\frac{1}{\tilde{S}_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)}}}\right)^{\frac{n+c-3}{2}},
\end{aligned}
$$

for $n \geq \max(N_1', N_1'')$. We would like to note that the arguments leading up to (5.11) only require the assumption $pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0) \subset pa_i(\mathscr{D})$. This observation enables us to use (5.11) in the proof of Lemma 5.4 and Lemma 5.5.

By following exactly the same sequence of arguments leading up to (5.9), and replacing $\mathscr{D}$ by $\mathscr{D}_0$, we get

$$||(\tilde{S}^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}})^{-1} - ((\Sigma_0)^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}})^{-1}||_{(2,2)} \tag{5.12}$$

$$\leq (||(\tilde{S}^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}})^{-1} - ((\Sigma_0)^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}})^{-1}||_{(2,2)} + \frac{1}{\epsilon_0})(\nu_i(\mathscr{D})+1)c'\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}\frac{1}{\epsilon_0}, \tag{5.13}$$

By Assumption 2, there exists N_1''' such that for $n \geq N_1'''$,

$$\frac{c'}{\epsilon_0}(3d+3)\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}} < \frac{1}{2}, \text{ and } 2\frac{c'}{\epsilon_0^2}(3d+3)\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}} < \frac{\epsilon_0}{2}. \tag{5.14}$$

Note that by hypothesis $\nu_i(\mathscr{D})+1 \leq 3\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0)+3 \leq 3d+3$. It follows from (5.12) that

$$||(\tilde{S}^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}})^{-1} - ((\Sigma_0)^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}})^{-1}||_{(2,2)} \leq 2\frac{c'}{\epsilon_0^2}(3d+3)\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}. \tag{5.15}$$

for $n \geq N_1'''$. Using $\nu_i(\mathscr{D}) - \nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0) \geq 1$, (5.11), (5.15), Proposition 5.2 (a) and the definition of q_n, it follows that for $n \geq \max(N_1', N_1'', N_1''')$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&B_i(\mathscr{D}, \mathscr{D}_0) \\
\leq& 2\tilde{M}\left(\frac{\delta_2}{\delta_1}\right)^{\frac{d}{2}} n^{2c} q \left(\frac{||((\Sigma_0)^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}_0})^{-1}||_{(2,2)} + 2\frac{c'}{\epsilon_0^2}(3d+3)\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}}{||(\Sigma_0)^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}_0})^{-1}||_{(2,2)} - 2\frac{c'}{\epsilon_0^2}(3d+3)\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}}\right)^{\frac{n-c+3}{2}} \\
\leq& 2\exp\left\{-d\left(\frac{\log p}{n}\right)^{\frac{1/2}{1+k/2}} n + d\log\left(\frac{\delta_2}{\delta_1}\right) + 2c\log n + \log\tilde{M}\right\} \\
&\times \left(1 + \frac{2\frac{c'}{\epsilon_0^2}(3d+3)\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}}{||((\Sigma_0)^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}_0})^{-1}||_{(2,2)} - \frac{\epsilon_0}{2}}\right)^n \\
\leq& 2\exp\left\{-d\left(\frac{\log p}{n}\right)^{\frac{1/2}{1+k/2}} n + d\log\left(\frac{\delta_2}{\delta_1}\right) + 2c\log n + \log\tilde{M} + \frac{12c'}{\epsilon_0^3}(d+1)\sqrt{n\log p}\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{M} = M\left(\frac{2}{\min(\epsilon_0,1)}\right)^c\sqrt{\frac{\delta_2}{\delta_1}}$. Since $\eta_n = d\left(\frac{\log p}{n}\right)^{\frac{1/2}{1+k/2}}$ has a strictly larger order than $\frac{d}{n}$, $\frac{\log n}{n}$ and $d\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}$ [2] it follows that there exists N_1'''' such

[2] We say a_n is of a larger order than b_n if $\frac{b_n}{a_n} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$

that for $n \geq N_1''''$, the expression in the exponent is dominated by $-\frac{\eta_n}{2}$. It follows that

$$B_i(\mathscr{D}, \mathscr{D}_0) \leq 2e^{-\frac{\eta_n}{2}n}$$

for $n \geq N_1 \stackrel{\Delta}{=} \max(N_1', N_1'', N_1''', N_1'''')$. □

LEMMA 5.4. *Assume* $pa_i(\mathscr{D}) \supset pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0), \nu_i(\mathscr{D}) > 3\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0)+2$ *and* $(\nu_i(\mathscr{D})+1)\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}} \leq \frac{\epsilon_0}{2c'}$, *then there exists* N_2 *(not depending on* i *or* $\mathscr{D}$*), such that for* $n \geq N_2$, $B_i(\mathscr{D}, \mathscr{D}_0) \leq \epsilon_{2,n}$, *where* $\epsilon_{2,n} = e^{-\eta_n n}$.

PROOF. By following exactly the same sequence of arguments leading up to (5.9), and replacing $\mathscr{D}$ by $\mathscr{D}_0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}&||(\tilde{S}_{\mathscr{D}}^{\geq i})^{-1} - ((\Sigma_0)_{\mathscr{D}}^{\geq i})^{-1}||_{(2,2)}\\ \leq&(||(\tilde{S}_{\mathscr{D}}^{\geq i})^{-1} - ((\Sigma_0)_{\mathscr{D}}^{\geq i})^{-1}||_{(2,2)} + \frac{1}{\epsilon_0})(\nu_i(\mathscr{D})+1)c'\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}\frac{1}{\epsilon_0},\end{aligned}$$

Using $(\nu_i(\mathscr{D})+1)\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}} \leq \frac{\epsilon_0}{2c'}$, $\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0) < \nu_i(\mathscr{D})$, and (5.9) we get

$$||(\tilde{S}_{\mathscr{D}}^{\geq i})^{-1} - ((\Sigma_0)_{\mathscr{D}}^{\geq i})^{-1}||_{(2,2)} \leq \frac{2c'}{\epsilon_0^2}(\nu_i(\mathscr{D})+1)\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}, \tag{5.16}$$

$$||(\tilde{S}_{\mathscr{D}_0}^{\geq i})^{-1} - ((\Sigma_0)_{\mathscr{D}_0}^{\geq i})^{-1}||_{(2,2)} \leq \frac{2c'}{\epsilon_0^2}(\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0)+1)\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}} \tag{5.17}$$

and

$$\frac{2c'}{\epsilon_0^2}(\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0)+1)\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}} \leq \frac{\epsilon_0}{2}. \tag{5.18}$$

Note that the arguments leading up to (5.11) only use $pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0) \subset pa_i(\mathscr{D})$. It follows from (5.11), Proposition 5.2, (5.16) and (5.17) that these exists N_2'

such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&B_i(\mathscr{D}, \mathscr{D}_0) \\
&\leq \exp\left\{ d \log\left(\frac{\delta_2}{\delta_1}\right) + 3c \log n \right\} \left(2q\sqrt{\frac{\delta_1}{\delta_2}}\right)^{\nu_i(\mathscr{D})-\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0)} \left(\frac{\frac{1}{\tilde{S}_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D})}}}{\frac{1}{\tilde{S}_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)}}} \right)^{\frac{n+c-3}{2}} \\
&\leq \exp\left\{ d \log\left(\frac{\delta_2}{\delta_1}\right) + 3c \log n \right\} \left(2q\sqrt{\frac{\delta_1}{\delta_2}}\right)^{\nu_i(\mathscr{D})-\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0)} \\
&\quad \times \left(\frac{\frac{1}{(\Sigma_0)_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)}} + \frac{2c'}{\epsilon_0^2}(\nu_i(\mathscr{D})+1)\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}}{\frac{1}{(\Sigma_0)_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)}} - \frac{2c'}{\epsilon_0^2}(\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0)+1)\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}} \right)^{\frac{n+c-3}{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

for $n \geq N_2'$. Note that $\nu_i(\mathscr{D}) > 3\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0) + 2$ implies $\nu_i(\mathscr{D}) + \nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0) + 2 \leq 2(\nu_i(\mathscr{D}) - \nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0))$ It follows by Assumption 1, (5.18) and $q = q_n = e^{-\eta_n n}$ that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&B_i(\mathscr{D}, \mathscr{D}_0) \\
&\leq \exp\left\{ d \log\left(\frac{\delta_2}{\delta_1}\right) + 3c \log n \right\} \left(2q\sqrt{\frac{\delta_1}{\delta_2}}\right)^{\nu_i(\mathscr{D})-\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0)} \\
&\quad \times \left(1 + \frac{\frac{2c'}{\epsilon_0^2}(\nu_i(\mathscr{D}) + \nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0) + 2)\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}}{\epsilon_0/2} \right)^{\frac{n+c-3}{2}} \\
&\leq \exp\left\{ d \log\left(\frac{\delta_2}{\delta_1}\right) + 3c \log n \right\} \left(2q\sqrt{\frac{\delta_1}{\delta_2}}\right)^{\nu_i(\mathscr{D})-\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0)} \\
&\quad \times \exp\left\{ \frac{8c'}{\epsilon_0}(\nu_i(\mathscr{D}) - \nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0))\sqrt{n \log p} \right\} \\
&\leq \left(2\sqrt{\frac{\delta_1}{\delta_2}} \exp\left\{ -\eta_n n + \frac{8c'}{\epsilon_0}\sqrt{n \log p} + d \log\left(\frac{\delta_2}{\delta_1}\right) + 3c \log n \right\} \right)^{\nu_i(\mathscr{D})-\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0)}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Since η_n has a strictly larger order than $\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}$, $\frac{d}{n}$ and $\frac{\log n}{n}$, there exists N_2 such that

$$
B_i(\mathscr{D}, \mathscr{D}_0) \leq \left(e^{-\frac{\eta_n}{2} n} \right)^{\nu_i(\mathscr{D})-\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0)} \leq e^{-\eta_n n}
$$

for $n \geq N_2$. □

LEMMA 5.5. *If $pa_i(\mathscr{D}) \supset pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)$, $\nu_i(\mathscr{D}) > 3\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0) + 2$ and $(\nu_i(\mathscr{D}) + 1)\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}} > \frac{\epsilon_0}{2c'}$, then there exists N_3 (not depending on i or $\mathscr{D}$), such that for $n \geq N_3$, $B_i(\mathscr{D}, \mathscr{D}_0) \leq \epsilon_{3,n}$, where $\epsilon_{3,n} = (\frac{1}{2\epsilon_0\delta n})^n$.*

PROOF. Since $\frac{1}{\tilde{S}_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D})}} = \left[(\tilde{S}_{\mathscr{D}}^{\geq i})^{-1}\right]_{ii}$ and $\tilde{S}_{\mathscr{D}}^{\geq i} \geq \left(\frac{U}{n}\right)_{\mathscr{D}}^{\geq i}$, we get

$$\frac{1}{\tilde{S}_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D})}} \leq \frac{n}{\delta_1}.$$

By (5.9) and Assumption 2, there exists N_3' such that for $n \geq N_3'$,

$$\frac{c'}{\epsilon_0}(d+1)\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}} < \frac{1}{2}, \text{ and } 2\frac{c'}{\epsilon_0^2}(d+1)\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}} < \frac{\epsilon_0}{2}.$$

Since $\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0) \leq d$, it follows by (5.9) and Assumption 1 that

$$||(\tilde{S}_{\mathscr{D}_0}^{\geq i})^{-1}||_{(2,2)} \geq \frac{\epsilon_0}{2}, \text{ and } \frac{1}{\tilde{S}_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)}} = \left[(\tilde{S}_{\mathscr{D}_0}^{\geq i})^{-1}\right]_{ii} \geq \frac{\epsilon_0}{2}.$$

for $n \geq N_3'$. Note that by hypothesis, we have

$$\nu_i(\mathscr{D}) > \frac{\epsilon_0}{2c'}\sqrt{\frac{n}{\log p}} - 1.$$

Since the arguments leading up to (5.11) only require $pa_i(\mathscr{D}) \supset pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)$, using the above facts along with Assumption 2, there exists N_3' such that for $n \geq N_3'$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
B_i(\mathscr{D}, \mathscr{D}_0) &\leq \exp\left\{d\log\left(\frac{\delta_2}{\delta_1}\right) + 3c\log n\right\}\left(2q\sqrt{\frac{\delta_1}{\delta_2}}\right)^{\frac{\epsilon_0}{2c'}\sqrt{\frac{n}{\log p}}-2d}\left(\frac{2n}{\delta_1\epsilon_0}\right)^{\frac{n+c-3}{2}} \\
&\leq \exp\left\{d\log\left(\frac{\delta_2}{\delta_1}\right) + 3c\log n\right\}\left(2q\sqrt{\frac{\delta_1}{\delta_2}}\right)^{\frac{\epsilon_0}{2c'}\sqrt{\frac{n}{\log p}}-2d}\left(\frac{2n}{\delta_1\epsilon_0}\right)^{n} \\
&\leq \left(\frac{n^2}{2\epsilon_0\delta}\right)^n q^{\frac{\epsilon_0}{2c'}\sqrt{\frac{n}{\log p}}-2d} \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{2\epsilon_0\delta}\exp\left\{-\frac{\epsilon_0}{2c'}\eta_n\sqrt{\frac{n}{\log p}} + 2\eta_n d + 2\log n\right\}\right)^n.
\end{aligned}$$

By Assumption 2 and Assumption 3, we obtain $\eta_n\sqrt{\frac{n}{\log p}}$ has a larger order than $\eta_n d$ and $\log n$. It follows that there exists N_3 such that

$$\begin{aligned} B_i(\mathscr{D},\mathscr{D}_0) &\le \left(\frac{1}{2\epsilon_0\delta}\exp\left\{-\frac{\epsilon_0}{4c'}\eta_n\sqrt{\frac{n}{\log p}}\right\}\right)^n \\ &\le \left(\frac{1}{2\epsilon_0\delta}\exp\{-\log n\}\right)^n \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2\epsilon_0\delta n}\right)^n \end{aligned}$$

for $n \ge N_3$. □

LEMMA 5.6. *If $pa_i(\mathscr{D}) \subset pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)$, then there exists N_4 (not depending on i or $\mathscr{D}$), such that for $n \ge N_4$, $B_i(\mathscr{D},\mathscr{D}_0) \le \epsilon_{4,n}$, where $\epsilon_{4,n} = e^{-\frac{\epsilon_0^2}{40}s_n^2 n}$.*

PROOF. Since $pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0) \supset pa_i(\mathscr{D})$, we can write $|\tilde{S}^{\ge i}_{\mathscr{D}_0}| = |\tilde{S}^{\ge i}_{\mathscr{D}}||R_{\tilde{S}^{\ge i}_{\mathscr{D}}}|$. Here $R_{\tilde{S}^{\ge i}_{\mathscr{D}}}$ is the Schur complement of $\tilde{S}^{\ge i}_{\mathscr{D}}$, defined by

$$R_{\tilde{S}^{\ge i}_{\mathscr{D}}} = \tilde{D} - \tilde{B}^T(\tilde{S}^{\ge i}_{\mathscr{D}})^{-1}\tilde{B}$$

for appropriate sub matrices $\tilde{B}$ and $\tilde{D}$ of $\tilde{S}^{\ge i}_{\mathscr{D}_0}$. It follows by (5.9) that if restrict to C_n^c,

$$||(\tilde{S}^{\ge i}_{\mathscr{D}_0})^{-1} - ((\Sigma_0)^{\ge i}_{\mathscr{D}_0})^{-1}||_{(2,2)} \le \frac{4c'}{\epsilon_0^2} d\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}},$$

for $n > N_1'$. It follows that

$$||R^{-1}_{\tilde{S}^{\ge i}_{\mathscr{D}}} - R^{-1}_{(\Sigma_0)^{\ge i}_{\mathscr{D}}}||_{(2,2)} \le \frac{4c'}{\epsilon_0^2} d\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}},$$

where $R_{(\Sigma_0)^{\ge i}_{\mathscr{D}}}$ represents the Schur complement of $(\Sigma_0)^{\ge i}_{\mathscr{D}}$ defined by

$$R_{(\Sigma_0)^{\ge i}_{\mathscr{D}}} = \bar{D} - \bar{B}^T((\Sigma_0)^{\ge i}_{\mathscr{D}})^{-1}\bar{B}$$

for appropriate sub matrices $\bar{B}$ and $\bar{D}$ of $(\Sigma_0)^{\ge i}_{\mathscr{D}_0}$. Let $\lambda_{min}(A)$ denote the smallest eigenvalue of a positive definite matrix A. By Assumptions 1 and

2, it follows that there exists N_4' such that

$$\left(\frac{|\tilde{S}^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}_0}|}{|\tilde{S}^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}}|}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{1}{|R^{-1}_{\tilde{S}^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}}}|^{1/2}} \leq \frac{1}{\left(\lambda_{\min}\left(R^{-1}_{(\Sigma_0)^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}}}\right) - Kd\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}\right)^{\frac{\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0)-\nu_i(\mathscr{D})}{2}}}$$
$$\leq \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon_0/2}\right)^{\frac{\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0)-\nu_i(\mathscr{D})}{2}} \quad \text{for large enough } n.$$

for $n \geq N_4'$. Since $pa_i(\mathscr{D}) \subset pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)$, we get

$$\tilde{S}_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)} \leq \tilde{S}_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D})}.$$

Let $K_1 = \frac{4c'}{\epsilon_0^2}$. By Lemma 5.1 and Proposition 5.2, and $2 < c_i(\mathscr{D}), c_i(\mathscr{D}_0) < c$, it follows that there exists N_4'' such that for $n \geq N_4''$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&B_i(\mathscr{D}, \mathscr{D}_0)\\
\leq& M\left(\frac{2}{\min(1,\epsilon_0)}\right)^c \left(\frac{\delta_2}{\delta_1}\right)^{\frac{d}{2}} n^{2c}\left(\sqrt{\frac{2n}{\delta_2\epsilon_0}}q^{-1}\right)^{\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0)-\nu_i(\mathscr{D})}\\
&\times\left(\frac{\frac{1}{(\Sigma_0)_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D})}} + K_1 d\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}}{\frac{1}{(\Sigma_0)_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)}} - K_1 d\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}}\right)^{\frac{n+2-3}{2}}\\
\leq& \left(\exp\left\{\frac{2d\log\left(\frac{\delta_2}{\delta_1}\right)+6c\log n}{n-1} + 8\eta_n\left(\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0)-\nu_i(\mathscr{D})\right)\right\}\right)^{\frac{n-1}{2}}\\
&\times\left(1+\frac{(\frac{1}{(\Sigma_0)_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)}} - \frac{1}{(\Sigma_0)_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D})}}) - 2K_1 d\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}}{\frac{1}{(\Sigma_0)_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D})}} + K_1 d\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}}\right)^{-\frac{n-1}{2}}\\
\leq& \left(\exp\left\{\frac{2d\log\left(\frac{\delta_2}{\delta_1}\right)+6c\log n}{n-1} + 8\eta_n\left(\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0)-\nu_i(\mathscr{D})\right)\right\}\right)^{\frac{n-1}{2}}\\
&\times\left(1+\frac{\epsilon_0 s_n^2(\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0)-\nu_i(\mathscr{D})) - 2K_1 d\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}}{2/\epsilon_0}\right)^{-\frac{n-1}{2}}. \qquad (5.19)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\frac{d\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}}{s_n^2} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ by Assumptions 2 and 4. Also, by Assumptions 2, 3 and 4, $d_n\eta_n \to 0$, $\frac{2d\log\left(\frac{\delta_2}{\delta_1}\right)+6c\log n}{n-1} \to 0$, and $\frac{\eta_n}{s_n^2} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.

Since $e^x \leq 1+2x$ for $x < \frac{1}{2}$, there exists N_4''' such that for $n \geq N_4'''$,

$$2K_1 d\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}} \leq \frac{\epsilon_0 s_n^2}{2},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\exp\left\{\frac{2d\log\left(\frac{\delta_2}{\delta_1}\right)+6c\log n}{n-1}+4\eta\left(\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0)-\nu_i(\mathscr{D})\right)\right\}\\
\leq&1+8\eta(\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0)-\nu_i(\mathscr{D}))+\frac{4d\log\left(\frac{\delta_2}{\delta_1}\right)+12c\log n}{n-1}\\
\leq&1+\frac{\epsilon_0^2 s_n^2}{8}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows by (5.19) and the above observations that

$$\begin{aligned}
B_i(\mathscr{D},\mathscr{D}_0) &\leq \left(\frac{1+\frac{\epsilon_0^2}{8}s_n^2(\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0)-\nu_i(\mathscr{D}))}{1+\frac{\epsilon_0^2}{4}s_n^2(\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0)-\nu_i(\mathscr{D}))}\right)^{\frac{n-1}{2}}\\
&\leq \left(\frac{1+\frac{\epsilon_0^2}{8}s_n^2}{1+\frac{\epsilon_0^2}{4}s_n^2}\right)^{\frac{n-1}{2}}
\end{aligned}$$

for $n \geq \max(N_4'', N_4''')$. The last step follows by noting that $\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0)-\nu_i(\mathscr{D}) \geq 1$. Since $pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)$ is non-empty by hypothesis, $\exists j \in \nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0)$ such that $|(L_0)_{ji}| \geq s_n$, which implies that $s_n^2 \leq (L_0)_{ji}^2 \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon_0}\left(\frac{[(L_0)_{ji}]^2}{(D_0)_{ii}}\right) \leq \frac{(\Omega_0)_{jj}}{\epsilon_0} \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon_0^2}$ and $\epsilon_0^2 s_n^2 \leq 1$. Note that $\frac{d_n}{s_n^2}\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Hence, there exists N_4 such that for $n \geq N_4$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
B_i(\mathscr{D},\mathscr{D}_0) &\leq \left(1-\frac{\frac{\epsilon_0^2}{8}s_n^2}{1+\frac{\epsilon_0^2}{4}s_n^2}\right)^{\frac{n-1}{2}}\\
&\leq \exp\left\{-\left(\frac{\frac{\epsilon_0^2}{8}s_n^2 2}{1+\frac{\epsilon_0^2}{4}s_n^2}\right)\left(\frac{n-1}{2}\right)\right\}\\
&\leq e^{-\frac{1}{10}\epsilon_0^2 s_n^2(\frac{n-1}{2})}\\
&\leq e^{-\frac{\epsilon_0^2}{40}s_n^2 n}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

LEMMA 5.7. *Suppose $\mathscr{D}$ is such that*

$$\begin{aligned} pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0) &\neq pa_i(\mathscr{D}) \\ pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0) &\nsubseteq pa_i(\mathscr{D}) \\ pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0) &\not\supseteq pa_i(\mathscr{D}), \end{aligned}$$

then, for $n \geq N_5$(not depending on i or $\mathscr{D}$), $B_i(\mathscr{D}, \mathscr{D}_0) \leq \epsilon_{5,n}$, where $\epsilon_{5,n} = \max(\epsilon_{1,n}, \epsilon_{2,n}, \epsilon_{3,n})\epsilon_{4,n}$.

PROOF. Let $pa_i^* = pa_i(\mathscr{D}) \cap pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)$, $\nu_i^* = |pa_i(\mathscr{D}^*)|$ and $\mathscr{D}^*$ be an arbitrary DAG with $pa_i(\mathscr{D}^*) = pa_i^*$. It follows that $pa_i^* \subset pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)$ and $pa_i^* \subset pa_i(\mathscr{D})$. Recall by Lemma 5.1 that,

$$\begin{aligned} B_i(\mathscr{D}, \mathscr{D}_0) =& M\left(\frac{\delta_2}{\delta_1}\right)^{\frac{d}{2}} n^{2c}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\delta_2}{n}}\frac{q}{1-q}\right)^{\nu_i(\mathscr{D})-\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0)} \\ &\times \frac{|\tilde{S}^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}_0}|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|\tilde{S}^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}}|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{\left(\tilde{S}_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)}\right)^{\frac{n+c_i(\mathscr{D}_0)-3}{2}}}{\left(\tilde{S}_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D})}\right)^{\frac{n+c_i(\mathscr{D})-3}{2}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & B_i(\mathscr{D}, \mathscr{D}_0) \\ \leq & M\left(\frac{\delta_2}{\delta_1}\right)^{\frac{d}{2}} n^{2c}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\delta_2}{n}}\frac{q}{1-q}\right)^{\nu_i(\mathscr{D})-\nu_i(\mathscr{D}^*)} \\ & \times \frac{|\tilde{S}^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}^*}|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|\tilde{S}^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}}|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{\left(\tilde{S}_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D}^*)}\right)^{\frac{n+c_i(\mathscr{D}^*)-3}{2}}}{\left(\tilde{S}_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D})}\right)^{\frac{n+c_i(\mathscr{D})-3}{2}}} \\ & \times M\left(\frac{\delta_2}{\delta_1}\right)^{\frac{d}{2}} n^{2c}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\delta_2}{n}}\frac{q}{1-q}\right)^{\nu_i(\mathscr{D}^*)-\nu_i(\mathscr{D}_0)} \\ & \times \frac{|\tilde{S}^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}_0}|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|\tilde{S}^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}^*}|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{\left(\tilde{S}_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)}\right)^{\frac{n+c_i(\mathscr{D}_0)-3}{2}}}{\left(\tilde{S}_{i|pa_i(\mathscr{D}^*)}\right)^{\frac{n+c_i(\mathscr{D}^*)-3}{2}}} \\ = & B_i(\mathscr{D}, \mathscr{D}^*) B_i(\mathscr{D}^*, \mathscr{D}_0). \end{aligned} \tag{5.20}$$

Note that $pa_i^* \subseteq pa_i(\mathscr{D})$. If $\nu_i(\mathscr{D}) \leq 3\nu_i(\mathscr{D}^*) + 2$, then using the fact that $pa_i^* \subseteq pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)$ and following exactly the same arguments as in the proof of

Lemma 5.3, it can be shown that

$$B_i(\mathscr{D}, \mathscr{D}^*) < \epsilon_{1,n}, \text{ for } n \geq N_1.$$

If $\nu_i(\mathscr{D}) > 3\nu_i(\mathscr{D}^*)+2$, then using the fact that $pa_i^* \subseteq pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)$ and following exactly the same arguments in the proofs of Lemma 5.4 and Lemma 5.5, it can be shown that

$$B_i(\mathscr{D}, \mathscr{D}^*) < \max(\epsilon_{2,n}, \epsilon_{3,n}), \text{ for } n \geq \max(N_2, N_3).$$

Hence,

$$B_i(\mathscr{D}, \mathscr{D}^*) \leq \max(\epsilon_{1,n}, \epsilon_{2,n}, \epsilon_{3,n}), \text{ for } n \geq \max(N_1, N_2, N_3).$$

Since $pa_i^* \subset pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)$, it follows by Lemma 5.6 that

$$B_i(\mathscr{D}^*, \mathscr{D}_0) \leq \epsilon_{4,n}, \text{ for } n \geq N_4.$$

By (5.20), we get

$$B_i(\mathscr{D}, \mathscr{D}_0) \leq \max(\epsilon_{1,n}, \epsilon_{2,n}, \epsilon_{3,n})\epsilon_{4,n}, \text{ for } n \geq \max(N_1, N_2, N_3, N_4).$$

□

With the lemmas in hand, Theorem 4.1 can be proved as follows. By Lemmas 5.3 - 5.7, if we restrict to the event C_n^c, and $pa_i(\mathscr{D}) \neq pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)$, then

$$B_i(\mathscr{D}, \mathscr{D}_0) \leq \epsilon_n^*$$

for every $n \geq \max(N_1, N_2, N_3, N_4)$, where $\epsilon_n^* \stackrel{\Delta}{=} \max\{\epsilon_{1,n}, \epsilon_{2,n}, \epsilon_{3,n}, \epsilon_{4,n}, \epsilon_{5,n}\} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ (by Assumption 4). Note that if $\mathscr{D} \neq \mathscr{D}_0$, then there exists at least one i, such that $pa_i(\mathscr{D}) \neq pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)$. It follows by Lemma 5.1, that if we restrict to C_n^c, then

$$\max_{\mathscr{D} \neq \mathscr{D}_0} \frac{\pi(\mathscr{D}|\boldsymbol{Y})}{\pi(\mathscr{D}_0|\boldsymbol{Y})} \leq \max_{\mathscr{D} \neq \mathscr{D}_0} \prod_{i=1}^{p} B_i(\mathscr{D}, \mathscr{D}_0) \leq \epsilon_n^*$$

for every $n \geq \max(N_1, N_2, N_3, N_4)$. By (5.6), $P(C_n^c) \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$. Theorem 4.1 follows immediately.

We now move on to the proof of Theorem 4.2, and only consider DAGs with number of edges at most $h = \frac{1}{8} d \left(\frac{n}{\log p}\right)^{\frac{1+k}{2+k}}$. By Lemmas 5.3 - 5.7, it

follows that if we restrict to C_n^c, then

$$\frac{1-\pi(\mathscr{D}_0|\boldsymbol{Y})}{\pi(\mathscr{D}_0|\boldsymbol{Y})} = \sum_{\mathscr{D}\neq\mathscr{D}_0,\mathscr{D} \text{ has atmost } h \text{ edges}} \frac{\pi(\mathscr{D}|\boldsymbol{Y})}{\pi(\mathscr{D}_0|\boldsymbol{Y})} \tag{5.21}$$

$$\leq \sum_{i=0}^{h} \binom{\binom{p}{2}}{i} \max_{\mathscr{D}\neq\mathscr{D}_0} \frac{\pi(\mathscr{D}|\boldsymbol{Y})}{\pi(\mathscr{D}_0|\boldsymbol{Y})} \tag{5.22}$$

$$\leq p^{3h} e^{-\frac{\eta_n n}{2}} \tag{5.23}$$

$$= e^{3h\log p - \frac{\eta_n n}{2}} \tag{5.24}$$

$$= e^{-\frac{1}{8}dn^{\frac{1+k}{2+k}}(\log p)^{\frac{1}{2+k}}} \tag{5.25}$$

for $n \geq \max(N_1, N_2, N_3, N_4)$. Theorem 4.2 follows immediately.

6. Posterior convergence rate. In this section, we will provide the convergence rate for the posterior distribution of the precision matrix under the conditions in Theorem 4.2. Before we state the result, we introduce required notation. For $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $\boldsymbol{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_p)^T$, let $||\boldsymbol{x}||_r = (\sum_{j=1}^{j=p} |x_j|^r)^{\frac{1}{r}}$ and $||\boldsymbol{x}||_\infty = \max_{1\leq j\leq p}|x_j|$ be the standard l_r and l_∞ vector norms. We consider the following norms on $p \times p$ matrices,

$$||A||_{\max} = \max_{1\leq i,j\leq p}|A_{ij}|,$$
$$||A||_{(r,s)} = \sup\{||Ax||_s : ||x||_r = 1\}, 1 \leq r, s \leq \infty.$$

In particular, if A is symmetric,

$$||A||_{(2,2)} = \{eig_p(A^T A)\}^{\frac{1}{2}} = |eig_p(A)|.$$

Let $\Pi(\ |\ \boldsymbol{Y})$ denote the probability measure corresponding to the posterior distribution.

THEOREM 6.1. *Under Assumptions 1-5, if $p = p_n \to \infty$ and we only consider DAG's with number of edges at most $\frac{1}{4}d\left(\frac{n}{\log p}\right)^{\frac{1+k}{2+k}}$, the following holds:*

$$\bar{E}[\Pi\{||\Omega - \Omega_0||_{(2,2)} \geq K\epsilon_n|\boldsymbol{Y}\}] \to 0, \text{ as } n \to \infty,$$

where $\epsilon_n = d^2\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}$.

The proof of this result is provided in the appendix. Based on Theorem 4.2, we first argue that it is enough to prove

$$\bar{E}[\Pi\{||\Omega - \Omega_0||_{\infty,\infty} \geq K\epsilon_n|\boldsymbol{Y}, \mathscr{D}_0\}] \to 0, \text{ as } n \to \infty,$$

and then leverage results from [18] along with the distributional properties of the DAG-Wishart distribution to establish the required result.

References.

[1] S. Banerjee and S. Ghosal. Posterior convergence rates for estimating large precision matrices using graphical models. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 8:2111–2137, 2014.

[2] S. Banerjee and S. Ghosal. Bayesian structure learning in graphical models. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 136:147–162, 2015.

[3] E. Ben-David, T. Li, H. Massam, and B. Rajaratnam. High dimensional bayesian inference for gaussian directed acyclic graph models. *Technical Report*, http://arxiv.org/abs/1109.4371, 2016.

[4] P. J. Bickel and E. Levina. Regularized estimation of large covariance matrices. *Ann. Statist.*, 36:199–227, 2008.

[5] N. El Karoui. Spectrum estimation for large dimensional covariance matrices using random matrix theory. *Annals of Statistics*, 36:2757–2790, 2008.

[6] D. Geiger and D. Heckerman. Parameter priors for directed acyclic graphical models and the characterization of several probability distributions. *Ann. Statist.*, 30:1412–1440, 2002.

[7] J. Huang, N. Liu, M. Pourahmadi, and L. Liu. Covariance selection and estimation via penalised normal likelihoode. *Biometrika*, 93:85–98, 2006.

[8] K. Khare, S. Oh, S. Rahman, and B. Rajaratnam. A convex framework for high-dimensional sparse cholesky based covariance estimation in gaussian dag models. *Preprint, Department of Statisics, University of Florida*, 2016.

[9] G. Letac and H. Massam. Wishart distributions for decomposable graphs. *Ann. Statist.*, 35:1278–1323, 2007.

[10] R. Mazumder and T. Hastie. Exact covariance thresholding into connected components for large-scale graphical lasso. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13:781–794, 2012.

[11] N. Narisetty and X. He. Bayesian variable selection with shrinking and diffusing priors. *Ann. Statist.*, 42:789–817, 2014.

[12] V.I. Paulsen, S.C. Power, and R.R. Smith. Schur products and matrix completions. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 81:151–178, 1989.

[13] M. Pourahmadi. Cholesky decompositions and estimation of a covariance ma- trix: Orthogonality of variance–correlation parameters. *Biometrika*, 94:1006–1013, 2007.

[14] A. J. Rothman, E. Levina, and J. Zhu. A new approach to cholesky-based covariance regularization in high dimensions. *Biometrika*, 97:539–550, 2010.

[15] A. Shojaie and G. Michailidis. Penalized likelihood methods for estimation of sparse high-dimensional directed acyclic graphs. *Biometrika*, 97:519–538, 2010.

[16] M. Smith and R. Kohn. Parsimonious covariance matrix estimation for longitudinal data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 97:1141–1153, 2002.

[17] G.N. Watson. A note on gamma functions. *Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc.*, 11:7–9, 1959.

[18] R. Xiang, K. Khare, and M. Ghosh. High dimensional posterior convergence rates for decomposable graphical models. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 9:2828–2854, 2015.

[19] G. Yu and J. Bien. Learning local dependence in ordered data. *arXiv:1604.07451*, 2016.

Appendix. *Proof of Theorem 6.1* First note that,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\bar{E}[\Pi\{||\Omega-\Omega_0||_{(2,2)} \geq K\epsilon_n|\boldsymbol{Y}\}] \\
=&\sum_{\mathscr{D}} \bar{E}[\Pi(||\Omega-\Omega_0||_{(2,2)} \geq K\epsilon_n|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D})\pi(\mathscr{D}|\boldsymbol{Y})] \\
\leq&\bar{E}\left[\Pi\{||\Omega-\Omega_0||_{(2,2)} \geq K\epsilon_n|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0\}\right] + \bar{E}[\Pi(\mathscr{D}\neq\mathscr{D}_0)|\boldsymbol{Y}] \\
\to&\bar{E}\left[\Pi\{||\Omega-\Omega_0||_{(2,2)} \geq K\epsilon_n|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0\}\right], \qquad \text{(A.1)}
\end{aligned}$$

which follows from Theorem 4.2. It suffices to show that

$$\bar{E}[\Pi\{||\Omega-\Omega_0||_{(2,2)} \geq K\epsilon_n|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0\}] \to 0, \text{ as } n\to\infty.$$

Since all further analysis is going to be conditional of $\mathscr{D}_0$ (based on the above observation), for notational convenience we will use $A^{>}_{\cdot i}, A^{>i}, A^{\geq i}$ to denote $A^{>}_{\mathscr{D}_0\cdot i}, A^{>i}_{\mathscr{D}_0}, A^{\geq i}_{\mathscr{D}_0}$ respectively. Next, we state some distributional properties for the Cholesky parameter (D,L) under the DAG-Wishart prior. Under the DAG-Wishart prior $\pi^{\Theta_{\mathscr{D}_0}}_{U,\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ on (D,L), the posterior distribution of (D,L) (given $\boldsymbol{Y}$ and $\mathscr{D}_0$) satisfies:

$$L^{>}_{\cdot i}|D_{ii},\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0 \sim N(-(\tilde{S}^{>i})^{-1}\tilde{S}^{>}_{\cdot i}, \frac{1}{n}D_{ii}(\tilde{S}^{>i})^{-1}), \text{ for } 1\leq i\leq p-1, \qquad \text{(A.2)}$$

$$D^{-1}_{ii} \mid \boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0 \sim \text{Gamma}(\frac{n+\alpha_i}{2}+1, \frac{nc_i}{2}), \text{ for } 1\leq i\leq p, \qquad \text{(A.3)}$$

where $\tilde{S} = S+\frac{U}{n}$, and $c_i = \tilde{S}_{ii} - (\tilde{S}^{>}_{\cdot i})^T(\tilde{S}^{>i})^{-1}(\tilde{S}^{>}_{\cdot i})$. These properties follow immediately from [3, Eq. (9),(10)], and will be useful in proving Theorem 6.1.

Note that to prove Theorem 6.1 we only need to show that $\Pi\{||\Omega-\Omega_0||_{(2,2)} \geq K\epsilon_n|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0\} \xrightarrow{\bar{P}} 0$ for a large enough K (where $\Pi(\cdot \mid \boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0)$ denotes the probability measure corresponding to the posterior distribution given $\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0$). By the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Pi\{||\Omega-\Omega_0||_{(2,2)} \geq K\epsilon_n|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0\} \\
=&\Pi\{||LD^{-1}L^T - L_0{D_0}^{-1}L_0^T||_{(2,2)} \geq K\epsilon_n|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0\} \\
\leq&\Pi\{||L||_{(2,2)}||D^{-1}-{D_0}^{-1}||_{(2,2)}||L^T||_{(2,2)} \geq \frac{K\epsilon_n}{3}|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0\} \qquad \text{(A.4)} \\
&+\Pi\{||L||_{(2,2)}||L-L_0||_{(2,2)}||{D_0}^{-1}||_{(2,2)} \geq \frac{K\epsilon_n}{3}|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0\} \\
&+\Pi\{||L_0||_{(2,2)}||L-L_0||_{(2,2)}||{D_0}^{-1}||_{(2,2)} \geq \frac{K\epsilon_n}{3}|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0\}.
\end{aligned}$$

For the first part of (A.4), by the triangle inequality again,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\Pi\{||L||_{(2,2)}||D^{-1}-{D_0}^{-1}||_{(2,2)}||L^T||_{(2,2)} \geq \frac{K\epsilon_n}{3}|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0\}\\
\leq&\Pi\{||L-L_0||^2_{(2,2)}||D^{-1}-{D_0}^{-1}||_{(2,2)} \geq \frac{K\epsilon_n}{12}|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0\}\\
&+2\Pi\{||L-L_0||_{(2,2)}||D^{-1}-{D_0}^{-1}||_{(2,2)}||L_0||_{(2,2)} \geq \frac{K\epsilon_n}{12}|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0\}\\
&+\Pi\{||L_0||^2_{(2,2)}||D^{-1}-{D_0}^{-1}||_{(2,2)} \geq \frac{K\epsilon_n}{12}|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0\}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{A.5}
$$

Similarly, for the other two parts of (A.4), using $\|L_0\|_{(2,2)}=1$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\Pi\{||L||_{(2,2)}||L-L_0||_{(2,2)}||{D_0}^{-1}||_{(2,2)} \geq \frac{K\epsilon_n}{3}|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_{\boldsymbol{0}}\}\\
\leq&\Pi\{||L-L_0||_{(2,2)} \geq \sqrt{\frac{K\epsilon_n}{6||{D_0}^{-1}||_{(2,2)}}}|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0\}\\
&+\Pi\{||L-L_0||_{(2,2)} \geq \frac{K\epsilon_n}{6||{D_0}^{-1}||_{(2,2)}}|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0\},
\end{aligned}
\tag{A.6}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\Pi\{||L_0||_{(2,2)}||L-L_0||_{(2,2)}||{D_0}^{-1}||_{(2,2)} \geq \frac{K\epsilon_n}{3}|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0\}\\
\leq&\Pi\{||L-L_0||_{(2,2)} \geq \frac{K\epsilon_n}{3||{D_0}^{-1}||_{(2,2)}}|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0\}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{A.7}
$$

By Assumption 1, we have $\frac{\epsilon_0}{2} \leq (D_0)^{-1}_{ii} \leq \frac{2}{\epsilon_0}$, for $1 \leq i \leq p$. Also, by Assumption 2, $\sqrt[4]{\epsilon_n} \geq \sqrt{\epsilon_n} \geq \epsilon_n$, for n large enough. By (A.4), (A.5), (A.6) and (A.7), to prove the required result, it suffices to show that both

$$\Pi\{||L-L_0||_{(2,2)} \geq K_1\epsilon_n|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0\} \xrightarrow{\bar{P}} 0,$$

and

$$\Pi\{||D^{-1}-{D_0}^{-1}||_{(2,2)} \geq K_1\epsilon_n|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0\} \xrightarrow{\bar{P}} 0,$$

for some large enough constant K_1.

Now, let $\delta_n = \frac{\epsilon_n}{d} = d\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}$. Then, for a large enough constant K_1, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\Pi\{||D^{-1}-{D_0}^{-1}||_{(2,2)} \geq K_1\epsilon_n|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0\}\\
\leq&\Pi\{\max_i(2|D_{ii}^{-\frac{1}{2}}-(D_0)_{ii}^{-\frac{1}{2}}|+(D_0)_{ii}^{\frac{1}{2}})|D_{ii}^{-\frac{1}{2}}-(D_0)_{ii}^{-\frac{1}{2}}| \geq K_1\delta_n|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0\}\\
\leq&\Pi\{\max_i|D_{ii}^{-\frac{1}{2}}-(D_0)_{ii}^{-\frac{1}{2}}| \geq \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{K_1\delta_n}|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0\} \xrightarrow{\bar{P}} 0,
\end{aligned}
\tag{A.8}
$$

by (A.3), [18, Lemma 3.9], and the fact that $\sqrt{\delta_n} \geq \delta_n = d\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}$ for large enough n by Assumption 2.

In order to show $\Pi\{||L-L_0||_{(2,2)} \geq K_1\epsilon|\boldsymbol{Y}, \mathscr{D}_0\} \xrightarrow{\bar{P}} 0$, first, by [18, Lemma 3.1] and the triangle inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Pi\{||L - L_0||_{(2,2)} \geq K_1\epsilon_n|\boldsymbol{Y}, \mathscr{D}_0\} \\
\leq&\Pi\{d||L - L_0||\max \geq K_1\epsilon_n|\boldsymbol{Y}, \mathscr{D}_0\} \\
&\leq\Pi\{||L - M||\max \geq \frac{K_1\delta_n}{2}|\boldsymbol{Y}, \mathscr{D}_0\} + \Pi\{||M - L_0||\max \geq \frac{K_1\delta_n}{2}|\boldsymbol{Y}, \mathscr{D}_0\},
\end{aligned} \tag{A.9}$$

where M is a $p \times p$ lower triangular matrix with unit diagonals defined as

$$M_{\cdot i}^{\geq} = \begin{Bmatrix} 1 \\ -(\tilde{S}^{>i})^{-1}\tilde{S}_{\cdot i}^{>} \end{Bmatrix},$$

for $1 \leq i \leq p$ and $M_{ji} = 0$ for $j \notin pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0), 1 \leq i < j \leq p$. For the first term of (A.9), by the union-sum inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Pi\{||L - M||\max \geq \frac{K_1\delta_n}{2}|\boldsymbol{Y}, \mathscr{D}_0\} \\
=&\Pi\{\max_{j\in pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0),1\leq i<j\leq p}|L_{ji} - M_{ji}| \geq \frac{K_1\delta_n}{2}|\boldsymbol{Y}, \mathscr{D}_0\} \\
\leq&\Pi\{\max_{j\in pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0),1\leq i<j\leq p}\frac{|L_{ji} - M_{ji}|}{\sqrt{D_{ii}}}(|\sqrt{D_{ii}} - \sqrt{(D_0)_{ii}}| + \sqrt{(D_0)_{ii}}) \geq \frac{K_1\delta_n}{2}|\boldsymbol{Y}, \mathscr{D}_0\} \\
\leq&pd\max_{j\in pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0),1\leq i<j\leq p}\Pi\left\{\frac{|L_{ji} - M_{ji}|}{\sqrt{D_{ii}}} \geq \sqrt{\frac{K_1\delta_n}{4}}|\boldsymbol{Y}, \mathscr{D}_0\right\} \\
&+ \Pi\{\max_{1\leq i\leq p}|\sqrt{D_{ii}} - \sqrt{(D_0)_{ii}}| \geq \sqrt{\frac{K_1\delta_n}{4}}|\boldsymbol{Y}, \mathscr{D}_0\} \\
&+ pd\max_{j\in pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0),1\leq i<j\leq p}\Pi\left\{\frac{|L_{ji} - M_{ji}|}{\sqrt{D_{ii}}} \geq \frac{K_1\delta_n}{4\sqrt{\max_i(D_0)_{ii}}}|\boldsymbol{Y}, \mathscr{D}_0\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\frac{\epsilon_0}{2} \leq (D_0)_{ii}^{-1} \leq \frac{2}{\epsilon_0}$ for $1 \leq i \leq p$, and $\sqrt{\delta_n} \geq \delta_n$ for large enough n by Assumption 2. By (A.5), (A.6), (A.7), (A.8) and (A.9), to prove the required result, it suffices to show that, for a large enough constant K_1

$$pd\max_{j\in pa(i),1\leq i<j\leq p}\Pi\left\{\frac{\sqrt{n}|L_{ji} - M_{ji}|}{\sqrt{D_{ii}}\sqrt{\left(\tilde{S}^{>i}\right)_{jj}^{-1}}} \geq K_1\delta_n|\boldsymbol{Y}, \mathscr{D}_0\right\} \xrightarrow{\bar{P}} 0,$$

$$\Pi\{\max_{1\le i\le p}|\sqrt{D_{ii}}-\sqrt{(D_0)_{ii}}|\ge K_1\delta_n|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0\}\xrightarrow{\bar{P}}0,$$

and

$$\Pi\{||M-L_0||\max\ge K_1\delta_n|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0\}=1_{\{||M-L_0||\max\ge K_1\delta_n\}}\xrightarrow{\bar{P}}0.$$

We will now prove each of these three statements.

1) First, let $Z_{ji}=\frac{\sqrt{n}|L_{ji}-M_{ji}|}{\sqrt{D_{ii}}\sqrt{(\tilde{S}^{>i})^{-1}_{jj}}}$, $c=\max_{1\le i<j\le p}\left(\tilde{S}^{>i}\right)^{-1}_{jj}$, where $\left(\tilde{S}^{>i}\right)^{-1}_{jj}, j\ge i$ represent the diagonal element of $\left(\tilde{S}^{>i}\right)^{-1}$ corresponding with vertex j. It follows from (A.2) that $Z_{ji}\sim N(0,1)$ conditional on $\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0,D_{ii}$. Since this distribution does not depend on D_{ii}, it follows that the distribution of Z_{ji} conditional on $\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0$ is also standard normal. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
&pd\max_{j\in pa(i),1\le i<j\le p}\Pi\left\{\frac{|L_{ji}-M_{ji}|}{\sqrt{D_{ii}}}\ge K_1\delta_n|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0\right\}\\
\le&pd\max_{j\in pa(i),1\le i<j\le p}\Pi\left\{\frac{\sqrt{n}|L_{ji}-M_{ji}|}{\sqrt{D_{ii}}\sqrt{\left(\tilde{S}^{>i}\right)^{-1}_{jj}}}\ge\frac{\sqrt{n}K_1\delta_n}{\sqrt{c}}|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0\right\}\\
\le&2pd\left(1-\phi\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}K_1\delta_n}{\sqrt{c}}\right)\right)\\
\le&2pd\exp\left(-\frac{nK_1^2\delta_n^2}{2c}\right)\\
\le&2p^{2-\frac{K_1^2}{2c}},
\end{aligned}\tag{A.10}$$

where Φ is the standard normal distribution function and $1-\Phi(t)\le\exp(-\frac{t^2}{2})$. The last inequality follows from $\delta_n=\frac{\epsilon_n}{d}=d\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}$. Next, for any $t>0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\bar{P}(2p^{2-\frac{K_1^2}{2c}}>t)\\
\le&\bar{P}(2p^{2-\frac{K_1^2}{2c}}>t,c<2\epsilon_0^{-1})+\bar{P}(c\ge2\epsilon_0^{-1})\\
\le&\bar{P}(2p^{2-\frac{\epsilon_0K_1^2}{4}}>\eta)+\bar{P}(c\ge2\epsilon_0^{-1}),
\end{aligned}\tag{A.11}$$

It follows from [18, Lemma 3.5] that $\bar{P}\{c\ge2\epsilon_0^{-1}\}\to0$ as $n\to\infty$. Also, when K_1 is large enough such that $2-\frac{\epsilon_0K_1^2}{4}<0$, we get $p^{2-\frac{K_1^2}{2c}}\to0$, as

$n \to \infty$. It follows by (A.11) that $2p^{2-\frac{K_1^2}{2c}} \xrightarrow{\bar{P}} 0$. By (A.10), we get

$$pd\max_{j\in pa(i),1\le i<j\le p}\Pi\left\{\frac{|L_{ji}-M_{ji}|}{\sqrt{D_{ii}}} \ge K_1\delta_n|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0\right\} \xrightarrow{\bar{P}} 0. \tag{A.12}$$

for a large enough constant K_1.

2) Next, let $r = \max_{1\le i\le p}\sqrt{D_{ii}(D_0)_{ii}}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Pi\{\max_{1\le i\le p}|\sqrt{D_{ii}} - \sqrt{(D_0)_{ii}}| \ge K_1\delta_n|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0\}\\
\le&\Pi\{\max_{1\le i\le p}|\sqrt{D_{ii}^{-1}} - \sqrt{(D_0)_{ii}^{-1}}| \ge \frac{1}{r}K_1\delta_n|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0\}\\
\le&\Pi\{\max_{1\le i\le p}|\sqrt{D_{ii}^{-1}} - \sqrt{(D_0)_{ii}^{-1}}| \ge \frac{1}{r}K_1\delta_n, r < \frac{4}{\epsilon_0}|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0\}\\
&+\Pi\{r \ge \frac{4}{\epsilon_0}|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0\}\\
\le&\Pi\{\max_{1\le i\le p}|\sqrt{D_{ii}^{-1}} - \sqrt{(D_0)_{ii}^{-1}}| \ge \frac{\epsilon_0}{4}K_1\delta_n|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0\}\\
&+\Pi\{\min_{1\le i\le p}(D_{ii}(D_0)_{ii})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \le \frac{\epsilon_0}{4}|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.13}$$

As observed before, by [18, Lemma 3.9],

$$\Pi\{\max_{1\le i\le p}|\sqrt{D_{ii}^{-1}} - \sqrt{(D_0)_{ii}^{-1}}| \ge \frac{4}{\epsilon_0}K_1\delta_n|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0\} \to 0.$$

for a large enough K_1. Also, using $\frac{\epsilon_0}{2} \le (D_0)_{ii}^{-1} \le \frac{2}{\epsilon_0}$ and [18, Lemma 3.9] again, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Pi\{\min_{1\le i\le p}(D_{ii}(D_0)_{ii})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \le \frac{\epsilon_0}{4}|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0\}\\
\le&\Pi\{\min_{1\le i\le p}(D_0)_{ii}(D_{ii}(D_0)_{ii})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \le \frac{1}{2}|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0\}\\
\le&\Pi\{\max_{1\le i\le p}|1-(D_0)_{ii}^{\frac{1}{2}}D_{ii}^{-\frac{1}{2}}| \ge \frac{1}{2}|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0\}\\
\le&\Pi\{\max_{1\le i\le p}|(D_0)_{ii}^{-\frac{1}{2}} - D_{ii}^{-\frac{1}{2}}| \ge \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_0}{2}}|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0\} \xrightarrow{\bar{P}} 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.14}$$

Hence, by (A.13) and (A.14), we get,

$$\Pi\{\max_{1\le i\le p}|\sqrt{D_{ii}} - \sqrt{(D_0)_{ii}}| \ge K_1\delta_n|\boldsymbol{Y},\mathscr{D}_0\} \xrightarrow{\bar{P}} 0. \tag{A.15}$$

3) Last, by [18, Lemma 3.2] and [18, Lemma 3.6], for $1 \le i \le p-1$,

$$(L_0)_{\overline{i}}^{\ge} = \begin{Bmatrix} 1 \\ -((\Sigma_0)^{>i})^{-1}(\Sigma_0)_{\cdot i}^{>} \end{Bmatrix}.$$

Hence, by [18, (3.24)], it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}&\bar{P}\{||M - L_0||_{\max} \geq K_1\delta_n\}\\ &\leq \bar{P}\{\max_{j\in pa_i(\mathscr{D}_0)1\leq i<j\leq p}|[(\tilde{S}^{>i})^{-1}\tilde{S}_{.i}]_j - [(\tilde{\Sigma}^{>i})^{-1}\tilde{\Sigma}_{.i}]_j| \geq \frac{K_1\delta_n}{2}\} \to 0\end{aligned} \tag{A.16}$$

for a large enough constant K_1. □

Department of Statistics
University of Florida
102 Griffin-Floyd Hall
Gainesville, FL 32611
E-mail: caoxuan@ufl.edu
kdkhare@stat.ufl.edu
ghoshm@stat.ufl.edu